1-1-1995

Assessing the learning of undergraduate students when using a social justice education game.

Maura J. Cullen
University of Massachusetts Amherst

ASSESSING THE LEARNING OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS WHEN USING A SOCIAL JUSTICE EDUCATION GAME

A Dissertation Presented

by

MAURA J. CULLEN

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1995

Education

ASSESSING THE LEARNING OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS WHEN USING A SOCIAL JUSTICE EDUCATION GAME

A Dissertation Presented

by

MAURA J. CULLEN

Approved as to style and content by:

Patricia S. Griffin

Patricia Griffin, Chair

Maurianne Adams

Maurianne Adams, Member

Patt Dodds

Patt Dodds, Member

Bailey W. Jackson

Bailey W. Jackson, Dean
School of Education

ABSTRACT

ASSESSING THE LEARNING OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS WHEN USING A SOCIAL JUSTICE EDUCATION GAME

MAY 1995

MAURA J. CULLEN, B.S., BRIDGEWATER STATE COLLEGE

M.Ed., SPRINGFIELD COLLEGE

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Patricia Griffin

Recently, many college administrators have attempted to create a climate on their campuses which emphasizes the importance of valuing all members of the campus community, encouraging diversity of the student population, and educating those who are intolerant of diversity. As a result, many students on our college campuses are resentful and angered by attempts to "force feed" them information regarding issues of diversity. Such resistance must be considered when planning a curriculum that emphasizes diversity education.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the use of an educational game lessens student resistance toward diversity education while increasing content, behavioral, and attitudinal change. Eighteen participants, a selected group of college students and facilitators, played the game for a 90-minute period, exploring racism and heterosexism during the playing of the game. Pre- and postgame interviews and two follow-up interviews (one week and four to six weeks later) were conducted with each participant. Participants were asked two broad questions:

How did participants experience playing the game? This was based on participants' perceptions, my observations during the playing of the game, interviews, and participants' journals.

Did playing the game influence the participants' knowledge, awareness, or actions regarding racism and heterosexism, and if so, how?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Students on college campuses come from a greater variety of social and cultural diversity backgrounds than ever before. Women and people of color show the largest increases in the college population. People with disabilities are attending college in greater numbers than ever before. Older adults are returning or entering college for the first time. These changes in student profiles reflect the findings reported by the American Council on Education and the Education Commission of the United States (1988) in a publication entitled One-Third of a Nation. This report asserts that by the year 2010 one third of the United States population will be racial minorities (Jones, 1990). On many college campuses, however, this increase in diversity among students has been a fairly rapid change. Arbeiter (1986) reports that from the fall of 1976 to the fall of 1982, the number of white students enrolled in colleges and universities increased by a little more than 5 percent while the number of minority students increased by more than 15 percent.

College students today must prepare to learn and work in a more socially and culturally diverse society. Colleges must bear some responsibility to prepare students for living in this new environment. Changing demographics make it necessary for campus programming to respond to such changes in the college social environment. Jones (1990) identifies three factors to consider in understanding the complicated process in which colleges that

are attempting to create an affirming environment for all students are engaged.

1. Most colleges are unprepared to deal with a diverse student population because they are accustomed to a homogeneous population. They have standardized their services on the basis of a homogeneous population of eighteen- to twenty-two-year-old, middle- to upper-class, White male students (Jones, 1990). Kuk states that "few would dispute the generalization that men have designed American higher educational institutions for the purpose of educating young, affluent white males" (Kuk, 1990, p. xx; Rich, 1975; Pearson, Shavlick, & Touchton, 1989). This characterization could also be expanded to include heterosexual, able-bodied Christians.

2. Most college officials talk about the importance of diversity but have not acted to transform programming and curricula. Most college administrators want to create a campus climate that emphasizes the importance of valuing all members of the community, encourages diversity among the student population, and educates those who are intolerant of diversity. Hughes (1989) explains that

> while rhetoric on diversity and tolerance abounds, many recent behavioral indicators of the values and attitudes of middle-class white students suggest a different story. The behavioral measures indicate dualistic thinking, where the individual views the world in absolutes of right and wrong and cultural differences are seen as deficiencies rather than as alternative world views. (as cited in Jones, p. 69)

Such dualistic thinking does not allow for the positive interchange between those who "fit in" and those who don't.

Theoretically, campus communities support the notion of free speech, particularly of those groups that have not had a dominant voice on our campuses in the past—women; people of color; gays, lesbians, and bisexuals;

disabled students; and older, nontraditional students. Much of this support is limited to rhetoric about how important diversity is on campus. Unfortunately, on most campuses, the practical applications and long-range plans for implementation of this rhetoric are lacking.

3. Most colleges are unprepared for the conflict and backlash that often accompany changes in campus demographics and programming. Many campuses that do initiate programs and course work focused on social justice education (SJE) are attacked by right-wing politically conservative groups such as the National Association of Scholars (NAS). Some faculty believe that academic courses on diversity or multiculturalism have no place in a college curriculum. Other opponents of multiculturalism believe that courses on the history of non-Western cultures distort and dilute the standard Western canon.

Some students join in with calls of reverse discrimination, claiming that other students receive preferential treatment and that they themselves are punished because they are White or male. Some students have attempted to create White student unions in response to the support Black student unions have received. "Political correctness" (P.C.) has angered students and faculty alike and has been paralleled to McCarthyism. As a result, many students on our college campuses are resentful and angered by attempts to force feed them information regarding issues of diversity.

Whatever their ethnic or racial background, most students come from monocultural communities and are unprepared for the diversity they encounter (Jones, 1990). It is not surprising to see such conflict result when students from cultural and social backgrounds other than White European arrive on a college campus that is Eurocentric in its ethnicity, culture, and traditions. Students from different cultures and backgrounds, many of whom

have little experience with people from social groups different from their own, must confront these differences for the first time.

Student backlash to strategies promoting the valuing of diversity include gay bashing, racist or sexist graffiti, and the creation of forums and groups whose intent is to oppose the valuing of diversity. "The cultural clashes are frequent and often violent" (Jones, p. 80). Recent reports indicate that campus environments are often hostile to female students, staff, and faculty (Hall and Sandler, 1982; Pearson, Shavlick, & Touchton, 1989). The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, in a 1988 report, indicated that 19percent of the 7,248 incidents of discrimination reported nationwide occurred on college campuses. Pennsylvania State University, in its 1989 report on hate-related incidents, stated that gay men and lesbians are the most frequent victims of "direct acts of intolerance" (Nickle, 1990/91, p. 52).

Other colleges place the burden of response on students who are the targets of violence by encouraging them to pursue formal criminal complaints outside the jurisdiction of the college. Institutional responses to student intolerance for social diversity are often punitive. Sanctions range from expulsion from the college to a talk with a college official. Some colleges choose to avoid sanctions altogether by ignoring the problems and hoping the problems will take care of themselves. And others refuse to acknowledge there is a problem at all.

Punitive and reactive responses to intolerance of diversity address each incident as an isolated case. These responses do not address student attitudes. The goal is to stop the intolerant behavior without necessarily educating students to change values and beliefs about diversity.

Some colleges do institute educational programs designed to teach students about social diversity in an attempt to create a more affirming

campus climate for all students. Some of these educational processes include credit-bearing social diversity courses, cultural programs, educational interventions in judicial sanctions, workshops, and informal discussions. The goal of such educational programs is to help students deal with the changing demographics by providing an opportunity to understand social diversity through planned educational programs.

Educating students about social diversity moves beyond punitive and reactive responses to student intolerance. Social justice education (SJE) is a specific kind of educational program that, in addition to teaching students about social diversity, also addresses social and historical patterns of oppression (Pope, 1990). A focus on oppression recognizes that all differences are not equal and that some social groups are given privileges while others are not. SJE focuses on raising individual consciousness about prejudice and stereotype socialization into personal beliefs about social diversity and the importance of acknowledging differences in social power and privilege among social groups. SJE challenges students to see how social oppression affects their lives and the lives of people from different social groups.

Significance of Study

Though change regarding diversity can occur on individual, cultural, or societal levels, this study will focus on the individual level. Because colleges' and universities' primary responsibility is educating the individual, educators must understand that, because SJE is important to the development of a socially conscious individual, they must also learn how to apply appropriate learning opportunities in SJE. Educators need to expect that there will be much resistance and misunderstanding in SJE, more than other disciplines. Therefore, to be more effective they must be prepared with

teaching strategies to deal with this resistance. Very few systematic investigations of educational programs address students' knowledge, awareness, and behavior regarding social justice education. Psychosocial developmental theory, social identity development theory, and learning style theory can provide theoretical guidelines for the creation of SJE action strategies.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the study is to describe the reactions of participants and facilitators to an SJE game designed to increase awareness and knowledge of racism and homophobia.

Questions this study will address are

1. How did participants experience playing the game?

2. How has playing the game influenced the participants' knowledge, awareness, and actions regarding racism and heterosexism?

Components of SJE as a Form of Education about Social Diversity and Social Justice

"The goals of SJE are not simply to give people new information, but rather to challenge the learner to actively question previous conceptions in light of new information" (Weinstein & Bell, p. 18). SJE focuses on personal attitude and behavior change and encourages intellectual learning. SJE is based on the belief that the cognitive development of the student must be matched with the student's individual development in order for the connection to be made between the cognitive domain (thinking) and affective domain (feeling). Belief systems have both a cognitive and affective components. Combining both these components is essential, because

otherwise the student may not personalize the learning experience, a key factor in SJE. The cognitive domain may be more receptive to change and new information. Beliefs will remain intact until they are challenged and a dissonance occurs (Pajares, 1992). Nespor (1987) suggests that cognitive systems are open to evaluation and critical examination but that beliefs are generally not. He adds, "Beliefs are far more influential than knowledge in determining how individuals define problems and are stronger predictors of behavior" (p. 321).

Some of the topics addressed in SJE include sexism, racism, ageism, ableism, anti-Semitism, classism, and heterosexism. The process is not neutral or unemotional; discussions can become intense. SJE cannot be handled completely and effectively if students are treated only intellectually (Weinstein & Bell, 1983). Challenging a person's personal belief system, therefore, often evokes resistance. Pajares (1992, p. 312) states, "Beliefs are surrounded by an emotional aura that dictates rightness and wrongness, whereas knowledge is emotionally neutral." This resistance or defensiveness can evoke anger and hostility toward the educator and the information being explored. Such resistance must be considered when planning SJE curricula. Not addressing the students' emotional needs at this point would undermine further efforts on the educator's part to make head-heart connections.

The process of SJE encourages students to be more interactive rather than passive participants. Freire (1968) criticized teaching methods that treat students as passive learners and knowledge as content to be uncritically acquired through rote memorization (Bell & Schniedewind, 1989). SJE activities encourage the participation of the students, and learning becomes a two-way rather than a one-way street. This interactive approach fosters an

environment where the students take responsibility for their own learning process and are not dependent solely on the instructor.

Educators in SJE use a variety of learning strategies: lectures, role plays, visualizations, group discussions, games, videos, drawings, and interactive exercises. By having a variety of strategies available, an educator can tap into a learner's experience, allowing for a more participatory and meaningful exchange. In 1938, John Dewey stated:

> Education is that reconstruction and reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience. . . . An activity which brings education or instruction with it makes one aware of some of the connections which had been imperceptible. (as cited in Chickering, 1981, p. 296)

Definition of Terms

Jackson and Hardiman (1986) describe oppression not only as a condition but also as a process.

> Oppression is a systematic social phenomenon based on the differences between social groups that involves ideological domination, institutional control, and the promulgation of the oppressor group's ideology, logic system and culture on the oppressed group. The result is the exploitation of one social group by another for its own benefit, real or perceived. (p. 4)

While some segments of society may benefit from oppression, they and groups who are disadvantaged alike are relegated to roles that seek to limit their potential as well as to define what is expected of them.

Oppressor/dominant refers to the role of position power under the condition of oppression. The terms oppressors and dominants will be used interchangeably. Oppressors/dominants are those groups or members of

those groups who systematically, socially, and culturally receive power and privilege in our society because of their social membership (Hardiman and Jackson, 1980). Oppressor/dominant groups in our society include males, Whites, gentiles, heterosexuals, able-bodied people, middle- to upper-class people, and young adults through middle-aged people.

The terms oppressed and targets will be used interchangeably. Oppressed/targets are those groups or members of those groups who are systematically, culturally, and socially denied equal access to power and resources in our society due to their social group membership (Hardiman and Jackson, 1980). Examples of oppressed/target groups include people of color; females; gays, lesbians, and bisexuals; people with disabilities; Jews and other religious minorities; working- and lower-class people; very young and very old people.

Jackson and Hardiman (1986) describe social group membership as "a group of people bounded or defined by a social characteristic such as race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, physical or mental capacity, age, class, etc." (p. 1).

As defined by Weinstein and Bell (1983), social justice education is

> an attempt, through carefully designed learning experiences . . . to have people confront the misconceptions, myths, or prejudices in their own thinking and behavior, as well as in their social context, that lead to and reinforce unequal treatment of certain groups in our society. It seeks to clarify and communicate the prevalent contradictions in how we say people should be treated in a democratic society and how in fact they are treated; how we as individuals, groups, and systems collude in maintaining such contradictions; in effect, how we maintain oppression. The foremost goal of Anti-Oppression Education is to interrupt such maintenance by attempting to change attitudes and behaviors so that they are more congruent with our democratic ideals. (p. 1)

Learning style has been referred to as "a student's consistent way of responding to and using stimuli in the context of learning" (Claxton & Ralston, 1978, p. 7). It is the way in which people receive and process information.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

There is much discussion and focus on multiculturalism and diversity on college campuses today. Conferences for higher education professionals focus on diversity topics. The Chronicle of Higher Education includes numerous articles about the impact of diversity on our campuses. Despite this coverage, there are few descriptions in current literature about what kind of format programs or curricula address diversity on college campuses.

The descriptions that are available show that attempts to conduct SJE on college campuses have focused on educating individual students, rather than systemic change within the colleges themselves. Too often these SJE interventions are limited to a single short program, either a couple hours in length or an awareness day or week, rather than long-term interventions. In contrast, many institutions have implemented required academic courses that focus on the accomplishments and culture of people of color and the accomplishments of women (Mooney, 1988; McNulty, 1989). The focus in these courses is to provide information about these groups that is not typically included in the mainstream curricula. Nonetheless, few colleges have implemented courses that explore majority/minority identity development and the concept of oppression. To be effective SJE should be a part of the standard curriculum, not an optional program. SJE interventions

also need a theoretical base that will serve as a guide for creating goals, purpose, and evaluation.

There is also a lack of consistency in defining which issues to address under the umbrellas of diversity and multiculturalism. Often these terms refer only to race and culture or ethnic differences. Pope and Reynolds (1990) call for a broader interpretation of the term multicultural stating that "in addition to responding to racial and ethnic concerns, the term multicultural can and should be inclusive of other groups such as gay, lesbian, and bisexual people, women, and people with disabilities" (p. 2). Their interpretation could also be extended to include age, socioeconomic class, size, and religion.

Such interpretations of diversity and multiculturalism would be consistent in recognizing the increasing diversity of student populations. This increase has implications for how we heighten dominant students' awareness and develop an appreciation of differences. An emphasis on diversity will most likely be met with hostility from dominant group members (Jones, 1990), but SJE educators must not be intimidated or fearful in raising these issues. As quoted in Hutchings and Wutzdorff (1988), Fricke states:

> Sometimes students don't understand an idea because they don't like it. Cognition and affect collide. Faced with a world view that violates their own, some otherwise capable students simply cannot engage in appropriate analysis. Nevertheless, with careful coaching, the dissonance of the new information countering the old information can move students toward a clearer sense of self and an ability to deal with different perspectives. (Hutchings & Wutzdorff, p. 15)

This ability to deal effectively with different perspectives must also take place at the administrative and faculty level. Currently, many administrators and faculty members are not addressing this concern adequately. "Through policies, role modeling, practices, and courses that do not develop

understanding of diversity, or prepare students for the realities of the twenty-first century, student affairs professionals and faculty essentially miseducate students" (Moore, 1990, p. 59). Administrators and faculty must face the challenges of educating a new generation of students.

This review of literature will describe a theoretical framework for the design of SJE for traditional college-age students to teach them tolerance and appreciation of diversity. To establish a theoretical basis, I describe three bodies of knowledge as they relate to individual learning in SJE: (a) developmental theory, more specifically psychosocial development; (b) social identity development theory; and (c) learning style theory.

These three theoretical areas were chosen because it is important to understand how they influence SJE. The theoretical bases that guide SJE must be identified so that appropriate strategies can be matched with the learners. Thus, the developmental level and learning style of the participants must be considered. According to Weinstein and Bell (1983), the facilitator must structure the learning environment so that it fosters learner and environment interaction. Social structure, design structure, and special procedural considerations must be addressed if this interaction is to be successful.

Within the social structure, a facilitator must consider issues involving social group membership. Workshop designs will often differ depending on the social identity of the learners, whether it is an all dominant group, all targets, or a mixed group. The social identity of the facilitator will also have a significant impact on the design. The issue of social group membership is further complicated by the fact that most people juggle the experience of being a dominant regarding one issue and being a target in another issue of oppression (Jackson & Hardiman, 1986).

Once educators have determined whom they are dealing with, the next key factor is figuring out how this person best receives information or what his or her learning style is. From this information we are better able to create SJE strategies to fit this individual. Sprinthall and Sprinthall (1981) state that learners respond to their own or a lower developmental level but cannot respond successfully to higher level interventions. It is vital, therefore, to determine the developmental level of the learner. Much like the adage that one must learn to walk before learning to run, careful attention must be paid to the learner's developmental level. Pushing too hard at the beginning stages of SJE might result in so much resistance on the part of the learner that he or she may leave the experience. Conversely, if SJE is without challenge, the learner may get bored and feel that the experience is a waste of time.

In SJE, the learner's level of consciousness about issues of oppression must also be assessed. It makes little sense to begin to strategize about possible solutions regarding issues of oppression if the learner has yet to acknowledge that problems exist. In that case, it would be appropriate to pose contradictions and to provide information and opportunities for the learner to question this new information. This climate will provide a safer and more supportive environment for the learner.

The first topic to be reviewed is the developmental process of college-age adults. Developmental theory is a broad concept that can be subdivided into three families: psychosocial developmental theories, cognitive developmental theories, and person-environment interaction theories. This study will focus primarily on psychosocial development theories because these theories are concerned with the content or "what" of the developmental process (Creamer, 1980).

Social identity development (SID) theory will be discussed because every individual's experiences are differently shaped in part by gender, race, and other social identities. For example, men experience life and are socialized differently from women, and people of color experience life differently from Caucasians. These differences must be considered when deciding how to design SJE.

The third topic is learning style theory. In order to teach SJE effectively, educators must understand how to transform information so that it is accessible to the learners. The educational designs for SJE should "match the specific needs, developmental levels, social group identity, readiness and learning styles of the learners in order to be effective" (Harro, 1986, p. 26). In short, educators must focus on how they are teaching as well as what they are teaching.

Theoretical Groundwork

One approach that SJE takes to teaching is that learning takes place as a result of the interaction between the person and the environment. This active dialogue between the two introduces new information and provides the learner with a new frame of reference from which to process old beliefs. Thus, the emphasis on understanding the developmental level of the student in conjunction with how best to create the learning environment is a key component to success in SJE. Educators can conclude that learners must be encouraged to take an active role in the learning experience if change is to be accomplished (Harro, 1986).

Rodgers points out (as cited in Creamer, 1990, p. 28), "In the 1980's, it became clear that . . . student development efforts tacitly focused mostly on the person (P) and often neglected the environment (E) and the interaction

(x)." Kurt Lewin (1936) devised an equation that states that behavior is a function of the person and his or her environment: B = f (P + E). His formula helps guide us through the theories introduced in this study. Psychosocial development theory is concerned with the P (person) part of the equation. The more you know about the person, the more systematic the educator can be in planning the E or the learning environment. The interaction between the P and the E are important in analyzing, predicting, or changing the B or behavior part of the equation. (Creamer, 1980). Certainly, one of the goals of SJE is to change behaviors as well as some of the attitudes related to those behaviors. Dewey believed that values and morals are important concerns of the educational curriculum and a legitimate aim of education.

Psychosocial Development Theories

Psychosocial theories combine feelings, behaviors, and thinking to understand experiences, while cognitive development theory examines assumptions and how a person thinks to make meaning of his or her experience (Rodgers, 1990). Though I have chosen to focus primarily on psychosocial development theory, in particular the work of Arthur Chickering, cognitive development theory will be discussed to supplement this presentation. I have selected psychosocial development theory in order to focus on emotions and issues in which college students are likely to be engaged. Chickering's work (1981; Thomas & Chickering, 1984) will aid in the layout of what those particular psychosocial issues generally are for traditional-age college students. The combination of Chickering and the oppression/liberation development model will lead to a profile of developmental issues and needs likely to be found with traditional-age

college students. What follows is an overview that contrasts psychosocial development theory with cognitive development theory.

Psychosocial Development Theory	Cognitive Development Theory
Stages are sequential but not invariant. They usually occur in order but can vary.	Stages are invariant sequence. Individual must pass through stages in order, with no skipping.
Stages are cumulative. One stage's resolution affects the ability to deal with future stages.	Stages are hierarchical. Each progressive stage is more adequate than previous stage.
Stages are not universal. People pass through stages differently.	Stages are universal. People pass through stages in predictable manner.
Concerned with the "what" content of development and the need to accomplish certain tasks.	Concerned with the "how" of development or the orderly changes in reasoning patterns.

Chickering's Vectors

What some developmental or cognitive theorists refer to as stages, Chickering labels as vectors (1969). He presents a psychosocial developmental model of college students and the impact of the college environment on their development. Chickering's theory is rooted in the work of Erikson (1968) and is an elaboration of Erikson's stages of identity and intimacy. Chickering, however, offers more specificity and concreteness to Erikson's generalizations regarding how students experience these stages (Rodgers, 1980). Chickering's theory can be used to define developmental goals and guide SJE programming efforts, as well as to provide ideas for programs that would be developmentally appropriate for students in different classes or ages and, therefore, would aid in the resolution of vectors or tasks (Rodgers, 1980). Chickering's work has become a classic for student personnel practitioners, in

part because it filled a void that other theories did not address: the development of college-age adults. His research sample focused on 17–25-year-olds from 13 liberal arts colleges. Descriptions of students and the college environment provide a theoretical yet realistic picture that connects those developmental experiences (Parker, Widick, & Knefelkamp, 1978). Chickering offers us a way of looking at students that may help us better understand where they are developmentally, thereby giving educators a better opportunity to meet their needs.

"Chickering refers to vectors instead of stages of development because each appears to have a direction and magnitude. Each vector includes a series of developmental tasks, a source of concern, and a set of outcomes" (Parker et al., 1978, p. 21). The seven vectors represent central themes in the lives of traditional college-age students. Chickering's seven vectors of development are described as follows: (a) developing competence, (b) managing emotions, (c) developing autonomy, (d) establishing identity, (e) freeing interpersonal relationships, f) developing purpose, and (g) developing integrity. Students need to meet the challenges of one vector before moving on to the next vector. The vectors represent a progression model, where the student moves from one vector to a more developed vector. This interactive model considers the interactions between the student and the college environment. Chickering asserts that certain events or experiences encourage growth and that identity maturation is not a natural process that happens on its own.

Table 1 outlines Chickering's seven vectors and the tasks involved during each.

Table 1. Chickering's vectors

DEVELOPING COMPETENCE
- Intellectual competence
- Physical/manual competence
- Social and interpersonal competence
- Learning theory, brain dominance, wellness

MANAGING EMOTIONS
- Increased awareness of feelings and integration of these feelings
- Development of useful and effective modes of expression
- Campus violence, date rape, drug abuse, anxiety, and depression

DEVELOPING AUTONOMY
- Emotional independence
- Recognition and acceptance of interdependence
- Individualism to social and global responsibility

ESTABLISHING IDENTITY
- Integration of self-image
- Influences from previous vectors, shaping by upcoming vectors
- Gender role and sexual orientation development, no age limits regarding career and family

FREEING INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS
- Increased tolerance and acceptance of difference
- Greater trust, independence and individuality in relations
- Greater emphasis on tolerance due to increased pluralism

DEVELOPING PURPOSE
- Articulation of goals and direction for the future
- "Who am I going to be? Where am I going?"
- Family redefined, integrating leisure, family and work

DEVELOPING INTEGRITY
- Awareness of the relativity of values
- Personalizing and congruence of values
- Social and personal responsibility

Note: Underlined words indicate additions to previous vectors (1981) by Chickering and Thomas (1984).

The vectors Chickering outlines are supported by other developmental researchers, both cognitive and psychosocial. Loevinger's work (1976) with ego development closely parallels managing emotions and freeing interpersonal relationship vectors, which emphasize increased tolerance and acceptance of difference. Perry (1970) offers another consideration when designing educational programs (as cited in King, 1978). He concluded that college-age adults develop increasingly complex assumptions about knowledge, which increase their ability to perform intellectually. His conclusion parallels the developing competency vector (Parker et al., 1978). Perry's cognitive theory of intellectual and ethical development also focuses on college students as a population. He describes nine position schemes that take the student from a simplistic, categorical view of the world to a realization of the relativity of knowledge to the formation of their identity.

Other Theories

Marcia (1966), like Chickering, was rooted in the work of Erikson. This psychosocial development theory identifies four different ego-identity statuses that represent styles of coping rather than vectors. Foreclosed students tend to be more conforming and dualistic about issues of morality (Podd, Marcia, & Rubin, 1970). They limit their contact with challenging individuals or ideas and avoid self-exploration. The identity diffused students experience identity confusion as they encounter challenges, while the moratorium students actively seek out self-examination opportunities. Achieved identity students are less occupied by internal struggles and are prepared to make meaning of the experience (Parker et al., 1978).

Though supported in the literature, Chickering's theory does have limitations. His focus on traditional college-age "dominant" students limits

the possibility of generalizing with his model. Gender, socioeconomic class, ability, sexual orientation, and race were not factored into Chickering's original research. As a result, his model did not take into account the diversity of the college population. He neglected the importance of diversity and social identity issues in the development of the college-age adult.

Chickering's Additions

Since his original research, Chickering has made some adjustments to his original vectors (Chickering and Thomas, 1984). These adjustments broaden the scope of his original work and attempt to rectify the concerns outlined above. Chickering's vectors were revised to include the following:

1. Developing competence. Originally focused on the student's ability to develop intellectual, physical, and social competence. Would be expanded to include recent information on learning theory, brain dominance, and the concept of wellness. The inclusion of learning theory supports my premise that understanding how a student learns may aid in the development of competency by helping SJE educators tailor learning experiences to student needs.

2. Managing emotions. Originally focused on what Chickering described as the key emotions such as aggression and sex. Broadened to include more recent issues and emotions that result from campus violence, substance abuse, date rape, sexual harassment, eating disorders, anxiety, and depression.

3. Developing autonomy. Chickering would rename this vector as "developing interdependence" in an effort to move from individualism to an emphasis on social and global responsibility. Initially this vector had

considered the ability of the student to become emotionally independent from parents and peers.

4. Establishing identity. Originally defined as the student's ability to develop a sense of self through the establishment of appropriate sexual identification, roles, and behaviors. Chickering would now include information on gender role development and sexual orientation and would dismiss previous age expectations regarding career and family. This addition is important because he acknowledges that people with different social identities establish their sense of self in different ways. Thus, he begins to rectify the previous biases regarding his sample research population, which was fairly homogeneous with regard to race, gender, and socioeconomic class.

5. Freeing interpersonal relationships. Originally defined as the student's ability to develop increased tolerance for others and the capacity for intimacy in relationships based on trust and independence. Chickering emphasizes the importance of this increased tolerance more than he previously did because of the increased cultural pluralism and diversity that now exists in the United States, a key element when discussing a student's development with regard to SJE.

6. Clarifying purpose. Originally defined as the ability to develop a sense of purpose, career, and lifestyle. Also includes the probability of many careers, not just one, and takes into account stress in the workplace and integrating work with family. Lifestyle issues include the concept of family being redefined (because of the increase of divorces, single-parent families, gay or lesbian families, and two parents with careers) and the fact that individuals must learn to juggle increased stress while finding time for leisure.

7. Developing integrity. Originally defined as the student's ability to develop his or her own personal belief system. Chickering now includes the development of a sense of social and personal responsibility. He speaks of closing the gap between the haves and have-nots (or oppressors/dominants and oppressed/targets). Chickering's revisions also support SJE efforts that clearly focus on the oppression and differences between the haves and have-nots.

By making such adaptations, Chickering has made his vectors of development compatible with issues college students face today. These changes reduce some of the bias and limitations with Chickering's vectors of development. Nevertheless, two more concerns remain.

One factor that continues to limit Chickering's model is that "he does not address the students' different motivational levels to progress through stages, but suggests that they will develop if they encounter situations which demand new responses" (Parker et al., 1978, p. 27). Parker et al. (1978) pose a question regarding this motivational element: "If encounters with diversity really do encourage development of tolerance, are there certain types of encounters occurring at certain times that are more helpful?" The authors call for a more adequate explanation of developmental change along the vectors that consider motivational elements (p. 27). I also believe that motivational consideration along the vectors can strongly influence the successful attainment of the tasks at hand. For example, if a student who is participating in SJE is forced to attend an experience as a result of a judicial sanction, that person's level of motivation will be low and will likely result in little educational gain. In contrast, if a student is self-motivated and excited about participating in SJE, he or she will most likely put more effort and energy into making the experience meaningful.

A second concern with Chickering's theory is that the vectors lack concrete behavioral and attitudinal descriptions (Prince, Miller, & Winston, 1974). Prince, Miller, and Winston (1970) created the student development task inventory (SDTI) in an attempt to translate Chickering's vectors into behavioral statements. Unfortunately, the SDTI at this point only defines development along three of the vectors (Parker et al., 1978).

Chickering's work guides us through some of the developmental issues of traditional-age college students. He provides us with a framework from which we can create strategies to aid students in their developmental process. Similarly, social identity development theories also help us to understand the process by which students come to understand and make sense of their social memberships and those of others.

Social Identity Development Theories

Many social identity development (SID) models explore the identity development of members of specific social groups; they identify a process that people who share a common social identity (racial, ethnic, sexual orientation) experience. SID models help make meaning of experiences that people in the same social group are likely to share. Social justice educators use SID models as a guide when choosing stage-appropriate programming or interventions. Some of the SID theories discussed here include gay identity development (Cass, 1979); minority identity development (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1983); majority group identity development (Helms, 1990); nigrescence models of racial identity (Cross, 1971, 1991); and oppression/liberation development theory (Hardiman & Jackson, 1980), which will serve as the primary focus.

Cass (1979) explores the process by which gay identity is formed. This six-stage process of sexual identity development addresses psychological and

sociological factors (Evans & Levine, 1990). The stages are labeled identity confusion, identity comparison, identity tolerance, identity acceptance, identity pride, and identity synthesis. An event or experience creates conflict in the individual's identity formation, which results in movement to the next stage or identity foreclosure.

The minority identity development (MID) describes a five-stage developmental process designed to address the developmental process for ethnic group members (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1983). These stages are labeled conformity, dissonance, resistance and immersion, introspection, and synergistic articulation and awareness. This model takes an individual from a stage of total immersion and assimilation through the point where the minority person develops elements from both the minority and dominant culture (Jones, 1990). Criticisms regarding the MID theory are threefold. First, it is unclear how individuals move from one stage to the next in this linear model and what factors initiate this movement. The second concern, raised by Helms (as cited in Jones, 1985, p. 62), is "the underemphasis of Anglo-America's responsibility for the perpetuation of racism." Helms believes that this model tends to blame the victim, placing too much emphasis on the ethnic individual and discounting any responsibility of racism to the dominant group. Further, like most other identity models, there is no parallel majority-group identity development model (Jones, 1990).

Hardiman and Helms (as cited in Helms, 1990), working independently, developed White racial identity models. Both models propose a linear process of development in which a White person advances through stages involving varying degrees of understanding racism and White consciousness. Both agree that the most advanced stages of both models involve self-education and personal responsibility for the elimination of

racism and the acknowledgement and understanding of one's Whiteness (Helms, 1990).

Helms developed the majority group identity development model (1985) which describes five stages of White awareness: contact stage, disintegration,reintegration,pseudoindependence immersion/emersion, and autonomy. The immersion/emersion stage was added to parallel Hardiman's belief that it is possible for Whites to conduct self-education, which is vital to the development of a positive White identity (Helms, 1990). Progression through these stages increases racial consciousness and sensitivity.

The contact stage occurs when the individual is oblivious to his own racial identity. Movement into the disintegration stage takes place when the person is able to acknowledge that he is White. Reintegration occurs as the person idealizes White people and White culture while denigrating Blacks and Black culture. Helms calls these first three stages Phase I, a phase necessary for the abandonment of racism.

The next three stages, referred to as Phase II, include the development of a positive White identity. As the individual intellectualizes an acceptance of race but has yet to internalize that acceptance, he is in the pseudo-independence stage. As he becomes more open and honest of his assessment of racism and of his White privilege, he has progressed into the stage Helms calls immersion/emersion. The final stage, autonomy, has the person internalizing a multicultural identity with his nonracist Whiteness because race is no longer perceived as a threat to his identity. Frequently cited in the literature, Helms offers us not a social change theory, but rather a cognitive look at how an individual makes meaning of his dominant racial identity (Jones, 1990).

Hardiman's model (1982) will be described briefly and then expanded upon when combined with Jackson's model of Black identity from which they together created the oppression/liberation development theory. Hardiman's White racial identity model is a four-stage process. In the acceptance stage the White person actively or passively accepts the premise of White superiority. The resistance stage is the first acknowledgement of the person's own racial identity. The redefinition stage attempts to redefine Whiteness from a nonracist perspective, while in the internalization stage the individual internalizes her own nonracist White identity.

Jackson and Cross also worked independently to create their own models of Black identity, referred to by Cross and others as nigrescence models of racial identity. Nigrescence can be defined as the developmental process by which a person "becomes Black" (Helms, 1990). Cross (1971, 1991) proposed a five-stage model through which one develops a positive Black identity. In the preencounter stage the Black individual identifies with White culture while rejecting Black culture. As he moves into the encounter stage, he begins to reject this previous identification with White culture and seeks identification with Black culture. The immersion/emersion stage is almost a complete turnaround from the preencounter stage, as the individual identifies with Black culture while denigrating White culture. The internalization stage is the internalization of a positive and personally relevant Black identity. The person is better able to renegotiate his position with Whites in a White society. The final stage, internalization/commitment, reflects this internalization of a positive Black identity while his commitment to fighting oppression is characterized by social activism (Cross, 1991).

Jackson's model of Black identity (1976) is a four-stage process that begins with the Black individual who copes by imitating White people and White culture; this first stage is referred to as passive/acceptance. In Jackson's second stage, active resistance, the individual rejects White culture and militantly identifies with Black culture. Redirection is the stage in which much of the focus and attention is paid to her Black identity, paying little attention to Whites. The final stage of internalization finds the individual filled with a sense of self and a strong sense of cultural identity.

Some of the social identity models mentioned to this point—for example, nigrescence models of racial identity (1971, 1991), gay identity development (1979), MID (1983), and majority group identity development (1985)—have two limitations. First, they are focused on one social group, a limitation because these models are riot-generalizable to other oppressed groups who may have a similar experience but are from different target groups. More important, however, these models discuss the identity formation of the individual as it relates to their social identity as either a dominant or target, not as both. Therefore, the experience of multiple identities, such as being a dominant in one area and a target in another, are not considered in their developmental process. Given these two considerations, Jackson and Hardiman's oppression/liberation development theory (O/LDM) (1980) fills these important voids. The O/LDM considers both dominant and target social identity development, is appropriate to any of the social identities, and considers the concept of oppression as a focal point.

The oppression/liberation development theory was refined by Jackson and Hardiman (1980) from the work of Cross (1973), Freire (1968), Hardiman (1982), Jackson (1976), and Kim (1981). "The Oppression/Liberation Development Model (O/LDM) describes the process that both the oppressor

and the oppressed move through in the struggle to attain a liberated social identity in an oppressive environment" (Jackson & Hardiman, 1980, p. 13). O/LDM is a generic model that is inclusive of the experience and development of oppressors as well as the oppressed. There are five developmental stages in O/LDM: (a) naive, (b) acceptance, (c) resistance, (d) redefinition, and (e) internalization. The labels for the developmental stages are the same for dominants and targets, but each goes through a different process of development. There are also two possible manifestations—active (conscious) and passive (unconscious). Those feelings or thoughts of which an individual is aware are active or conscious, while those of which she is not aware are passive or unconscious.

Jackson and Hardiman (1986) suggest that to fully understand oppression three factors must be considered: (a) the different levels of oppression (individual, institutional, and sociocultural); (b) the degree of awareness or consciousness; and (c) application (attitudes and behaviors). They also suggest that all of these are interactive in nature. One cannot be examined unless the interconnectedness of all is understood; each influences and supports the others in the system of oppression.

Table 2 outlines the oppression/liberation developmental model stages for targets and dominants.

Table 2. Outline of oppression/liberation development model

Stages:	Targets/oppressed	Dominants/oppressor
1. Naive	Little or no social awareness; no identity as a member of a social group. Behavior: clueless.	Little to no conception of surrounding social environment; learns dominant world's rules and messages. Behavior: clueless and colluding.
2. Acceptance	Identification with the dominants' logic system; denies or rationalizes the oppression; accepts stereotypes; slight understanding of the existence of contradictions; assimilation is most effective. Behavior: passive or accommodating.	Identification with social system and social group privilege; blame oppressed people for their own oppression; dominants' ways are "normal," "the way things are done"; begins to question or acknowledge some injustices. Behavior: dominance and blame.
3. Resistance	Challenges and confronts acts of oppression; experiences feelings of anger, frustration, and rage; experiences a sense of self power; begins to move from "who am I not" to "who am I?" Behavior: hostile and confrontational.	Questions and challenges oppressive institutions or individuals; recognizes and/or displays own group's oppressive behavior; distances or disassociates from dominant group membership. Behavior: guilt, shame, anger, and reactionary.
4. Redefinition	Focus on own social group, history, and culture; focus on "who am I?"; possesses a sense of pride; joins with members of same social group at similar stage to rename experience; often labeled "separatists"; begins to understand the interconnectedness of oppression. Behavior: cool and distant.	Has self-interest in eradicating oppression, not other-focused; focused on what it means to be a member of dominant group; prides vs. superiority; understanding of interconnectedness. Behavior: introspection and pride.
5. Internalization	Test new consciousness and identity in wider context; appreciation and understanding of all oppressed people; must nurture new identity to sustain hostile environment. Behavior: assertive and self-confident.	Internalize new identity where it becomes automatic; nurtures new identity in hostile environments. Behavior: allying.

Note: Adapted by M. Cullen from Jackson and Hardiman, Oppression/Liberation Development Model (1980).

O/LDM is not an age-related process but a developmental one, where an individual moves to the next stage by some initiating experiences or events. Movement within stages is motivated by a sense that a particular stage no longer fits the person adequately, and as a result the individual attempts to make sense of his experience through the use of another stage (Harro, 1986).

Many college students can be categorized into one of the first four stages: naive, acceptance, resistance, or redefinition. Only a few students will be at the last stage, internalization. I would like to focus, therefore, on the first four stages of the O/LDM.

An individual in the naive stage does not identify herself as a member of any social group. In this developmental stage she yields power to those in authority, such as parents, teachers, media, relatives, and significant others (Jackson and Hardiman, 1986). It is difficult for a person in this stage to even acknowledge that there are problems in the social order. Even so, she has come to understand the rules and messages of the dominant world. She may make statements regarding oppression such as "What problem?" or "People are people" or "We're all alike." During this stage, the resistance will be due in part to a lack of information and experience regarding diversity.

Jackson and Hardiman label the next stage of the O/LDM as acceptance. The individual experiencing this stage has accepted the social structure as it presently exists and rides the current. It would not occur to students at this stage to swim upstream or go against the current. Assimilation is the name of the game. Students at this stage go to great lengths to "fit in." They wear similar styles of clothes and join the "in" organizations. Peer pressure is a powerful force during this stage, often determining the behavior of the individual. Difference is seen as bad or threatening. This understanding of

difference and the need to fit in make it difficult for the learner engaged in SJE.

The third stage is identified as resistance. The individual has moved from having a slight understanding of the contradictions existing around her to understanding these contradictions so well that she will confront these acts. Passive and accommodating behavior yields to hostility and confrontation. Just as Chickering described the managing emotions vector, individuals in the resistance stage will experience very strong feelings. It is common for an individual in this stage to feel anger, rage, and frustration towards individuals as well as systems or institutions. She feels a sense of empowerment with her new sense of identity. She is cautious and suspicious of people who do not share her new philosophy. Her suspicion presents a dilemma in managing her strong emotions because she finds herself no longer as trusting of the people she previously trusted unconditionally.

In the next stage, redefinition, the anger and frustration experienced during the resistance stage are now transposed into a sense of pride. An individual in this stage begins to find support by associating with others in the same social groups or people in the same stage of development as herself.

Student organizations such as women's centers, the gay, lesbian, and bisexual alliance, or fraternal groups for students of color, are typically formed by individuals in this stage. Forming these groups lessens the feelings of isolation and rage of the earlier stage. A student at this stage of development is often labeled as a separatist, not willing to mix with the mainstream. At this point she begins to paint a very clear picture of who she is and what she is about.

A student at the redefinition stage also begins to understand the interconnectedness of all forms of oppression. Through a spirit of cooperation

and teamwork she begins to break the cycle of oppression. She begins to form alliances with different social groups, allowing them to have a stronger voice.

An exploration of Chickering's student development theory and Jackson and Hardiman's O/LDMbrings an understanding of the many factors affecting individuals during their developmental process. The next section will create some practical applications by combining both theories.

Oppression/Liberation Theory and Chickering's Vectors

No direct relationship between O/LDM and Chickering's model exists. In other words, if a student is in one vector of Chickering's development, his stage of development in the O/LDM cannot be predicted. Examining these theories in relationship to each other may provide a profile of how traditional college-age students might pass through their own psychosocial development while dealing with issues of oppression.

In Chickering's developing competence vector, an individual builds a base from which to progress to the next vectors of development, which is also true of the O/LDM naive stage. In order to move to the next stage, the individual needs to obtain some information and self-knowledge. Though Chickering describes three levels of competence which must be mastered during this stage, I will focus on only two of them.

Intellectual competency is concerned with the development of intellectual skills and acquiring information. Research suggests that the highest level of change takes place within the first two years of college, with the most change in critical thinking happening during the first year (Dressel & Lehmann, 1965). It is a time to provide the student with information about who he is and about the social order that exists around him. Both Chickering's and Jackson and Hardiman's models suggest that an individual

must have an informational base before moving on to the next vector or stage. Students entering educational institutions seek competency and look to gather information about how to survive on campus.

During the development of intellectual competency, Chickering asserts the importance of symbols for communicating. As E. M. Bower states,

> Symbols are learned by individuals as a function of "experiencing" objects, events, and relationships. . . . Our basic tool for this sparking between objects and symbols has been the written and spoken word. Indeed, language is our royal road to defining not only what surrounds us in the environment but what we are as an organism. (as cited in Chickering, 1981, p. 27)

Language can be used as a common ground in SJE because it can pose the contradictions that will emerge for individuals, particularly those in the initial stages or vectors of development. An individual in the naive stage of the O/LDM has little knowledge of the oppressive behaviors and patterns that exist around him and never realizes how he may be contributing to this oppression. Therefore, the SJE educator must demonstrate how the individual's behavior can be oppressive. For instance, a person engaged in the naive stage of O/LDM typically asserts, "I'm not prejudiced," or "I would never hurt anyone." Yet a common element shared by almost every human being is that he has used "hurt words" (that is, derogatory remarks or slurs).

Once the educator poses the contradiction of how that individual has hurt people by using those stereotypical slurs, the individual must consider his action. Since almost everyone has used hurt words, the participant can join with the facilitator and other participants of SJE in discovering for themselves why these words are used. Once the individual understands the power of these words, he can begin to understand how these words hurt other

people. By aiding him in his pursuit of intellectual competency, the educator better prepares the individual for making the connections when developing his social and interpersonal competency.

White (as cited in Chickering, 1981), describes competence as the ability of a person to flourish and grow within her environment. Social and interpersonal competency refers to the individual's ability to manage herself with the world around her. Students looking to achieve social competency are asking such questions as "What are the rules?" and "How do I fit in?"

An individual in the acceptance stage has little understanding of the complexities of oppression and diversity. He tends to view things from a dualistic perspective, seeing things as either "right or wrong," "black or white." He is unaware of shades of gray and finds it nearly impossible to understand perspective different from his own. As he gains more social and interpersonal competency, he begins to understand that "as part of a cooperative effort one must listen as well as talk, follow as well as lead, understand the concerns and motives of others, and avoid excessive imposition of one's own viewpoint" (Chickering, p. 33). "Increased competency provides the individual with an increased readiness to take responsibility, an increased openness, and an increased willingness to take risks with one's self-esteem" (p. 37).

With the newfound information delivered during the acceptance (O/LDM) and developing competency (Chickering) stages comes a wave of emotion. Chickering labels his next vector managing emotions, in which an increased awareness of feelings not experienced before allows the individual to loosen repressions and restrictions previously learned and to acknowledge that contradictions do exist. The primary task during this vector is to find useful and effective ways of managing these new emotions, then to find

where they fit in and how they get integrated. During this vector a participant in SJE will feel overwhelmed; not only is he challenged by new information, but this information has posed many contradictions in how he views the world. Emotions are likely to swing from one direction to another during this vector.

During the third stage of the O/LDM, resistance, the individual's sense of self and identity begins to emerge. And though he has begun to integrate some of these feelings and emotions, he may not have found useful and effective modes of dealing with them. It is at this stage that the individual may be caught between two of Chickering's vectors, managing emotions and developing autonomy. A college-age adult experiencing this stage of resistance is often labeled as a troublemaker, uncooperative, or difficult. He will often confront or speak out against the forces of oppression without regard to consequences. People in positions of authority no longer yield the clout or power they once had. The individual begins to challenge administrators, faculty, friends, and even family. He is apt to organize rallies, write articles in the school newspaper, or join in protest marches in an effort to channel some of his anger and rage in a more acceptable way. Those being challenged do not appreciate being challenged, and as a result they begin to distance themselves from him. Soon the individual in this stage of development will begin to feel isolated and in need of support.

The redefinition stage of the O/LDM may join avenues with the developing autonomy vector of Chickering's model. It is here that the individual gains emotional independence on social justice issues. In the past other people's perceptions weighed very heavily on his decision-making process. If he thought he would be ostracized if he didn't go along with the crowd, he wouldn't confront acts of oppression. By achieving emotional

independence the individual gains the confidence to make his own decisions with less interference from others. Taking risks is seen as less threatening even when it involves peers.

During this stage there is also a recognition and acceptance of interdependence. Though the individual at this vector has worked hard for some semblance of autonomy and independence, he also acknowledges that he cannot exist by and for himself. Similarly, the redefinition stage is when he understands the interconnectedness of oppression, acknowledging his own sense of self but understanding that he cannot do it alone.

Both Chickering's model and the O/LDM suggest that issues can recycle in a person's life (Rodgers, 1980). For example, one could have resolution in one area of oppression such as racism, but may not be as developed in sexism. She would, therefore, be using a different stage of development for that issue. Because each person's perception of reality determines her behavior, attention must be paid to this human subjectivity during the educational process (Combs, Richards, & Richards, 1976). SJE educators must find the balance between supporting the learner and challenging the learner. If the challenge is too great, the learner may become resistant or give up. If the educator is overly supportive, the learner may stagnate.

Within SJE a definite hierarchy of stage development exists. The idea of SJE is to take someone from the present stage he is in to the next stage. People can get "stuck" in certain stages, given their social identity or the issue at hand. For instance, a White person may be at Stage Three in her development regarding race, but on issues regarding people who are disabled she may be only at Stage Two. Most people also have multiple identities as dominants and targets. An individual may be at different levels regarding her dominant identities and her target identities.

According to Weinstein and Bell (1983) an individual can get "unstuck" as well, which is what SJE is about. As Weinstein and Bell suggest, he can be nudged into the next stage of development, but in order to nudge him appropriately into the next stage, the SJE educators must assess which stage the participant is currently in so that they may select strategies and interventions appropriate to that stage level.

Everyone does not move through all the stages of the O/LDM model. In fact, it is more common for people to remain in the first two stages of naive and acceptance. People move through these stages because of experiences, increased knowledge and awareness, and by having contradictions posed to them. By maintaining the status quo, people will inevitably stay stuck in the first few stages of development.

How does a person's social identity influence her identity development? Is a person who belongs to a target or oppressed group more likely to move through these stages than a person who is dominant? An individual who has been oppressed can usually draw from experiences that dominants most likely have not encountered. This experiential base is another tool that can be tapped to aid in the developmental process. An individual who belongs to an oppressed group is often able to understand or empathize with people in other oppressed groups more than someone who is not in an oppressed group.

Oppression is a learned phenomenon, and, as such, it can be relearned. This learning does not take place overnight, however. Dominants and targets alike need to go through a process of relearning about the oppression that exists within each of them.

Understanding what level of identity development the participant is currently in is imperative to the success of SJE. This information will build a

strong base for the antioppression work ahead. How does one go about selecting strategies and interventions for SJE? SJE educators may frame their interventions in many ways. One framework I will discuss is the concept of learning styles.

Learning Style Theory

Learning style is the process of how people gather information and make sense of that experience. Learning style theories can be categorized into four models: personality models, information-processing models, social-interaction models, and instructional-preference models (Claxton & Murrell, 1987). Each of these will be explained briefly, with the main focus on the information-processing models. This focus on how information is processed is particularly important in SJE because if educators are better able to understand how the learner learns, they can create educational experiences that enhance that process.

The model adapted by Curry (1983) and Claxton and Murrell (1987) compares the four models of learning styles. Both models use the analogy of an onion to describe each of the layers of a person's characteristics, which they refer to as style. At the core of the onion are the basic characteristics of personality. The next layer involves information-processing models and describes how a person takes in and makes sense of information. The third layer of the onion would be the social-interaction models, which describe how students interact and behave in an educational setting. And the fourth layer of the onion would involve the learning environments and instructional preferences. My discussion below presents the layers in this order, with the exception of the second layer, the information-processing models, which I discuss last.

Personality Models

The innermost layer of the onion is about basic personality dispositions toward particular cognitive styles. Personality models include the works of Witkin, the Myers-Briggs type indicator (MBTI), and the omnibus personality inventory (OPI). Witkin focused on the field dependence and field independence dimensions of cognitive style. People who are heavily influenced by the surrounding field or exterior surroundings are referred to as "field dependent," while people who are relatively immune to influences of the surrounding field are called "field independent" (Claxton & Murrell, 1987).

The MBTI is used extensively in higher education, more specifically in student affairs. It was created as an instrument to aid in applying Jungian theory in counseling, education, and business (Myers, 1976). According to this indicator, people vary in how they take in information (perception) and the ways in which they make decisions (judgment). In addition to these two elements, perception and judging, there is also a preference toward introversion or extroversion (Claxton & Murrell, 1987).

The omnibus personality inventory (OPI) was developed in the late 1950s in an effort to measure the intellectual, interpersonal, and social-emotional development in college students. It consists of fourteen scales that measure different modes of thinking, feeling, and ways of relating. It is especially helpful to use once a person becomes conscious of his or her cognitive style (Claxton & Murrell, 1987).

Social-Interaction Models

The third layer of the onion builds on personality factors as a person applies these in interacting with the environment. Two social-interaction models seem appropriate to SJE.

Fuhrmann and Jacobs (as cited in Claxton & Murrell, 1987) use a social-interactionist model that includes three styles: dependent, collaborative, and independent. No one style is considered better than another, but one may be more appropriate given a particular situation. Students who have little information, like those in Jackson and Hardiman's naive stage, might benefit from a dependent style in the beginning. Students in the redefinition stage may do well with a collaborative style.

Grasha and Reichmann (1974) developed the Grasha-Reichmann student learning style scales (GRSLSS) with the aid of undergraduate students who were asked to categorize typical student styles in the classroom. Six learning styles were identified:

1. Independent students prefer thinking and working on their own.
2. Dependent students have little motivation and learn only what is expected.
3. Collaborative students learn best when they have the opportunity to share with others in the class.
4. Competitive students are motivated by doing better than their classmates.
5. Participant students assume responsibility for learning the course content and enjoy going to class.
6. Avoidant students are not interested in learning and do not participate.

Grasha and Reichmann developed classroom activity preferences for each style from these six styles. Their premise was that classroom activities must be varied in order to effectively teach to students with each of these styles.

Instructional-Preference Models

Within the educational environment, students have preferences for particular teaching methods; this is the last layer of the onion. Two such models, the Canfield (1980) and Hill (1973) models, will be discussed in this section. Canfield's work was influenced by the work of Maslow and his hierarchy of needs and McClelland's work on achievement motivation. Canfield's learning style inventory (1980) consists of scales in four areas: conditions of learning, content, the students' preferences in terms of learning mode, and expectations, focusing on grades. A study conducted by Canfield (1980) at Miami-Dade Community College found that students who were taught in ways that matched their learning styles achieved higher scores and had more positive attitudes toward education (Claxton &d Murrell, 1987).

Joseph Hill and his associates (1973) developed cognitive-style mapping, in which they asserted that a student's learning style could be mapped and then interpreted. A comprehensive framework, referred to as "educational sciences," provided a scientific language for education. This framework included seven areas: (a) symbols and their meanings; (b) cultural determinants; (c) modalities of influence; (d) memory-concern; (e) cognitive style; (f) teaching, counseling, and administrative style; and (g) systematic analysis decision making (Claxton & Murrell, 1987). Hill's ultimate goal was for students to enroll in courses taught in their learning style. The five learning models available would include lecture, individualized program

learning, videotapes, audiotapes, and small group seminars with peer tutoring.

Information-Processing Models

Argyris and Schon (1974) created a theory of action that describes the interaction between an "espoused theory" and a "theory-in-use." With espoused theory, one enters a situation and the knowledge and information he intends to use. Once he is in a given situation, however, an imbalance or contradiction is sometimes created, which necessitates a restructuring of the espoused theory. What he actually does, or, through the use of hindsight, what he would do differently, is referred to as the theory in use (Hutchings & Wutzdorff, 1988). Given this information, it is very important when conducting SJE to allow contradictions to happen or even create situations where the students' old sets of thoughts and values (espoused theory) clash with new information to create a theory-in-use.

The work of David Kolb will serve as the cornerstone for the discussion of learning style theory as applied in SJE. Kolb's theory is an information-processing model broad enough to allow flexibility in the educational setting. When conducting SJE, the educator must explore the process in which students receive their information, allowing the SJE educator more opportunities to make the information accessible to the students.

Kolb's theory is also easy to understand, and its base is in experiential learning. Based primarily on the works of John Dewey (1938), Jean Piaget (1952), and Kurt Lewin (1951), experiential learning takes an interactionist approach to learning. It is not a set of educational methods or a bag of tricks that the educator uses on the student; it is the understanding that people do

learn from their experiences. Experiential learning is not a strict stage-related theory. Rather, individuals progress developmentally by interacting with their environment as previously described by Lewin's formula, B = f (P + E). The goal of the educator is to construct an environment that will provide the experiences and stimulations so that the individual will proceed through stages (Greene, 1982). In his book Experiential Learning (1984), Kolb quotes Chickering:

> Experiential learning leads us to question the assumptions and conventions underlying many of our practices. It turns us away from credit hours and calendar time toward competence, working knowledge, and information pertinent to jobs, family relationships, community responsibilities, and broad social concerns. It reminds us that higher education can do more than develop verbal skills and deposit information in those storage banks between the ears. . . . It can help students cope with shifting developmental tasks imposed by the life cycle and rapid social change. (p. 7)

The complex structure of learning allows for the emergence of many ways in which an individual will come to process information. Individuals unconsciously program themselves so that the transformation of information and experience is most meaningful. How individuals condition or program themselves to learn is referred to as a learning style. In his theory of experiential learning, Kolb (1984) describes learning as a four-step process and that individuals emphasize the following modes of learning to varying degrees: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation (see Table 3). He says, "As more of these modes (Stice, 1987) are used, learning is enhanced, rising from 20 percent retention if only abstract conceptualization is used to 90 percent if all four modes are used" (p. 293). Learners have concrete experiences about which they reflect from different perspectives. From these reflective observations,

they create generalizations or theories (abstract conceptualization). Then learners use these theories to guide further action (active experimentation), which tests what they have just learned (Claxton & Murrell, 1987). Kolb argues for learning experiences that are designed to provide this systematic learning cycle in which all four modes are used.

Though learning is most meaningful when all four modes are used, an individual will often rely on one or two styles that are more comfortable. Each of these learning styles has strengths and limitations. When an individual limits himself to one or two ways of learning, he reduces the likelihood of understanding the information, particularly if it is presented in one of the other learning modes.

Educators should create ways to help students learn which are not their preferred mode of learning. By providing such opportunities and creating this intentional mismatch, ecucators will allow students to become more skilled learners (Claxton & Murrell, 1987). The same is true for the educator. If the SJE educator conducts the session using only one or two of the learning styles, he or she risks the chance that many of the students will not assimilate the information because it was not presented in their learning style.

Caution is suggested, however, when providing a mismatch of learning styles. The learner will either adapt to the new learning style or tune out the information being shared (Kolb, 1984). Kolb also suggests that "motivation to learn may well be a result of learning climates that match learning styles and thereby produce successful learning experiences" (Kolb, p. 182). Therefore, mismatching the experience with the learner's style may result in a decrease of motivation by the learner. Varying the tools of teaching will provide more information to the learner.

A longitudinal study to assess learning styles found that during their college careers, students move from more concrete experiences to a greater use of abstract conceptualization (Mentkowski & Strait, 1983). This study also showed increased emphasis from reflective observation to active experimentation. Such research might suggest that age or class year be considered when designing the learning experience.

Bruner (1966) also postulates that these modes of presentation are age or education related. This age-relatedness can be seen as a limitation, suggesting that adults may not use all of these modes. Bandler and Grinder (1976) dispute this age-relatedness and suggest that these modes of understanding are ways people make sense of the world and that they are not age related. Bandler and Grinder believe that people have preferred ways of learning and will use those ways of learning to understand and process information better. If a child uses these three modes of understanding while developing, she would continue to use them through adulthood. As Jerome Bruner (1966) states, "If information is to be used effectively, it must be translated into the learner's way of attempting to solve the problem" (p. 53). He adds, "A curriculum, in short, must contain many tracks leading to the same general goal" (p. 71). SJE educators need to create many different ways of giving the same information to accommodate participants using these different modes of understanding.

Bruner (1966) proposed a theory of instruction rather than a learning theory. He characterizes learning theory as descriptive, describing what happens after the fact. Theory of instruction, in contrast, is prescriptive; it describes in advance how something can be taught. Bruner believes that a person has three means of achieving understanding: enactive, iconic, and symbolic representation. Referred to as the mode of presentation, these three

means are the technique or the method in which information is communicated. Because Bruner's modes of presentation are similar to Kolb's four learning styles, I will discuss Bruner's model at length.

Enactive representation is learning by doing or understanding through action. Bruner describes this mode as typically the initial step that should be used in education. As stated in Sprinthall and Sprinthall's Educational Psychology (1990), "[In] the enactive stage of thinking, the best, the most comprehensible messages are wordless ones" (p. 245). When considering SJE with the enactive mode, the facilitator may consider games, simulation activities, and small group exercises so that the participants are actively engaged in the educational process. This mode would parallel Kolb's style of active experimentation.

Iconic representation is understanding through visualization, imaging, graphs, and pictures. When considering SJE in conjunction with the iconic mode of understanding, a facilitator might consider visualization or fantasy exercises, having participants draw, recall past experiences, or transfer information by using graphs, diagrams, or other visual aids. This would parallel Kolb's style of reflective observation.

Symbolic representation is understanding experience through the abstraction of language. Bruner suggests that adults are more apt to use this mode of understanding. When considering SJE and the symbolic representation mode of understanding, the facilitator might consider panels, discussion groups, debates, and role plays. This stage parallels Kolb's abstract conceptualization style.

Bruner also asserts that use of these modes may vary due to the subject matter and the individual involved, but that development is innately sequential, moving from enactive to iconic to symbolic. Caution must be

exercised when offering such a conservative and strict sequence. People will often translate information given in one mode to another mode that is more accessible to them. I suggest that the sequence of these modes of understanding is not as important as ensuring that all three modes of understanding are used during the educational process.

Table 3. Kolb's four learning styles

Style	Learning by	Possible teaching strategies
Concrete experience (CE)	FEELING: From specific experiences; relating to people; sensitivity to feelings and people	Visualizations; keeping a personal journal; recalling certain experiences in the past; focusing on feelings and experiences on worksheets; form training groups (T groups); respond discussions
Reflective observation (RO)	WATCHING & LISTENING Careful observations before making a judgment; viewing things from different perspec tives; relying on own thoughts and feelings to form opinions	Videos, music, and slide shows; visual or audio aids (overheads, time lines, maps, etc.); panel discussions; observe skits or plays; fishbowls
Abstract Conceptualization (AC)	THINKING Logical analysis of ideas; systematic planning; acting on an intellectual understanding of a situation	Brainstorming sessions or focus groups; create a plan or strategy for a particular problem; worksheets to identify problems and solutions; reading assignments; participate in a debate; trivia or question-and-answer period; list possible solutions
Active experimentation (AE)	DOING Ability to get things done; risk taking; influence people and events through action;	Role plays or skits; games or simulations; interactive exercises; participation in a march or demonstration

Note: Adapted from Kolb, Learning-Style Inventory (1985).

Some methods of teaching reflect an abstract conceptualization style of learning, which is consistent with such teaching styles as lecturing and reading assignments. In this format the teacher does most of the talking while the students listen and take notes. Theoretically, higher education encourages students to rely on their own thoughts to form their decisions. Though this style of reflective observation is thought to be used in college classrooms, the reality is that it often is not. Students are given mixed messages. They are encouraged to express their own ideas, but if their ideas are in conflict with those of the instructor, they often receive the message that their ideas are not valid. Some styles of teaching do not reflect this welcoming of ideas or styles of learning. It is more the exception than the rule when teachers break the students into smaller groups, use exercises, or use varied teaching strategies.

It is also unusual for teachers to explore feelings as a vehicle for learning with students. Much of the literature already described reveals the powerful impact that understanding one's own experiences can have on the learning process. By having the students recall past experiences, role play, or visualize different scenarios, the teacher creates another arena of learning. This arena involves the movement of cognitive thoughts in the head to more experiential ones in the heart. This head-to-heart connection is vital to the success of SJE. If the students are allowed only to intellectualize the concepts of oppression, this connection will not be made. If this connection is not made, the students rarely personalize the effects of oppression and therefore do not understand how or if it influences them. They feel that issues of oppression do not influence their lives personally and consequently are of little importance. Having students get in touch with their own

experiences and feelings concerning these issues will allow them to personalize the concepts, facilitating the connection between head and heart.

Research on learning styles has been conducted primarily from a Western, White, middle-class perspective (Claxton & Murrell, 1987). As the culture continues to become more pluralistic, educators will have to remedy the narrow consideration of how cultural differences influence how individuals learn. One of the purposes of studying learning styles is to acknowledge and understand individual differences so that methods may improve. The goal in conducting SJE is not simply to understand the past; it is to comprehend the separate experiential threads out of which we must weave a different future (Goldenberg, p. 145).

Integration of Theoretical Frameworks for SJE

Table 4 provides four examples of how one's identity development stage can influence the focus of an activity. This three-dimensional chart demonstrates how Chickering's model, O/LDM and learning styles theory can guide the SJE educator in choosing appropriate strategies. One specific teaching strategy was selected within each of Kolb's four learning styles to demonstrate how the same teaching strategy can be altered when considering the identity stage of the participants. The strategies selected are consistent with the coinciding learning style.

The bottom of the grid describes Bruner's model of enactive, iconic, and symbolic ways of making meaning. The enactive model parallels Kolb's stages of concrete experience and active experimentation, learning by doing. Learning through language or thinking is identified by symbolic representation or Kolb's abstract conceptualization. Understanding through

visual aids or observation is referred to as iconic and coincides with Kolb's reflective observation style.

Under each of the identity development stages are words that describe the identity development stage of the individual regarding issues of oppression. Clueless refers to the person's naïveté or lack of awareness. Collusion refers to the individual who allows the oppression to continue by not challenging. Confrontation describes the stage in which the individual is challenging the oppression. Connectedness refers to the individual who has begun to see the interrelatedness of all the oppressions to begin to form coalitions.

Table 4. Integration of three theoretical frameworks for SJE

	Concrete experience	Active experiment	Abstract conceptualization	Reflective observation
Identity development stage	Recall	Role play	Worksheet	Panel
Social identity development stage/ Psychosocial development stage				
Naive/ managing competence (clueless)	Recall a time when you were made to feel different and when you made someone else feel different.	Scenario: Dominant and/ or target person is unaware of the bigotry being acted out. Discuss.	Complete the "Who am I?" social identity sheet and first memories sheet. Discuss.	Panel of targets to speak about their experiences and the discrimination they face.
Acceptance/ managing emotions (collusion)	Recall a time when you went along with someone being mistreated due to his or her social identity.	Scenario: Dominant and/ or target is aware of oppression but does not act. Discuss.	Research and create a time line outlining important historical and social civil rights legislation in the past century.	Mixed panel of allies and targets to break through denial of the existence of oppression and pose some contradictions.
Resistance/ developing autonomy and establishing identity (confrontation)	Recall when you confronted someone around issues of oppression. Describe the interaction and your feelings.	Scenario: Person confronts oppression directly. Discuss.	Identify five oppressive situations and identify ways to confront or challenge them.	Mixed panel of allies and targets to talk about frustrations and feelings that this new knowledge brings and allying.
Redefinition/ freeing internalized relationships and developing purpose (connectedness)	Recall a time when you missed an opportunity to confront or build coalitions with other people from other oppressed groups.	Scenario: Person confronts another having same social identity regarding oppressive behavior toward people in other oppressed groups. Discuss.	Create strategies and time line to begin to build coalitions between the groups on your campus.	Panel of like group membership, i.e., people of color talk with people of color and White panelists speak with White participants about racism.
	[---------ENACTIVE---------]		SYMBOLIC	ICONIC

Summary

Educators involved in teaching SJE education have many challenges before them. To keep pace with the changing demographics and how they influence college students, the SJE educator must balance challenging our students with a supportive environment. In order to be successful, one must consider three factors: the participants' psychosocial development, social identity development, and the individual's learning style.

SJE educators must begin to utilize strategies and educational tools that have a strong theoretical basis. By utilizing such strategies and tools, the SJE educator will create an opportunity in which the participants are more likely to have a meaningful educational experience. By varying teaching techniques to meet a wide array of learning styles, the SJE educator increases the likelihood of capturing the attention of more participants while also reaching some participants at several different learning levels.

John Dewey envisioned schools as places where diversity, opportunity, and education create the conditions for a just community (Bell, 1989). The challenge for educators is to reach students once they are in our structured learning environments to address both the content as well as the means for SJE.

SJE educators must continue to be creative while providing education around issues that can be challenging for participants. The likelihood of success can be increased when the participants' social identities and developmental levels as well as their learning styles are considered before creating the educational experience.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to describe the reactions of participants and facilitators to a social justice education (SJE) game designed to increase awareness and knowledge of racism and homophobia.

Questions this study will address are

1. How did participants experience playing the game?

2. How has playing the game influenced the participants' knowledge, awareness, and actions regarding racism and heterosexism?

This chapter describes the methodology for gathering and analyzing data. The first section describes the game Collidascope, its uses, and how it was developed. The next section outlines procedures for obtaining participants, number and characteristics of participants, and participant selection procedures. The setting is described next, followed by a review of access issues. Research design, its strengths and weaknesses, will be discussed in the next section, and it is followed by a description of the data collection methods. Data analysis is outlined in the next section, and trustworthiness strategies are reviewed in in the following section. Finally, the time line outlines the entire process for the study in the last section.

Description of Game

Collidascope is an educational game that addresses six topical areas relating to SJE: ableism, heterosexism, Jewish oppression, racism, sexism, and contemporary issues (such as eating disorders, environmental concerns, and AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases). Collidascope was created as an educational intervention to address controversial and confusing issues prevalent in today's society. The single most important goal of Collidascope is to deepen participants' knowledge and awareness of these topics by discussing their thoughts and feelings regarding these issues.

The game was developed by the researcher and Dawn Thompson as a way to address two concerns they perceived as barriers to effective SJE, the first of which was participants' resistance to SJE. Although not all participants will be resistant, the creators wanted to develop a SJE strategy that participants would find as fun, engaging, and informative. The second barrier was the lack of attention given to differences in student learning styles when planning SJE interventions. Learning style theory guided the development of the game.

Although there are several ways in which the game can be played, it is usually played in teams, which allows participants to feel safer while engaging them in dialogue. The game was designed specifically to address the developmental issues of traditional-aged college students, although it may be used with other groups.

Eight learning modes are used to ensure variety and participation, including role plays, facts, debates, lists, create a plan, respond, recall, and visualizations. These learning modes are used in the situation cards, a set of 20 cards for each category which place participants in challenging situations or dilemmas. Examples of the situation cards are below.

Create a Plan

You want to establish a gay, lesbian, bisexual support group on campus. Create a plan and timeline on how this will be accomplished.

Debate

Should it be mandatory for students to take a least one African American, Latin American, etc. studies course during college? One team debates why it should be mandatory, and the other team why it should not be mandatory.

Each category has 70 fact cards containing historical, cultural, and statistical information. These cards are presented in a multiple-choice or true/false format. One fact card reads as follows:

Head covering worn by Jewish men on the sabbath.

a. Yarmulke
b. Latke
c. Menorah

After the players on a team have correctly answered a fact card in a given category, they are then given a situation card. The first team that answers a fact card correctly and participates in a situation card in each of the six categories wins the game.

Participant Selection

Although Collidascope can be used with any group, purposeful sampling was used primarily because the game is often used to train staff members, particularly student staff in a college or university residence hall. Two groups served as participants for this study: resident assistants (RAs), who actually played the game, and residence directors (RDs), who facilitated it. Participants were selected from two different colleges.

RAs are student staff who live in the college and university residence halls and are responsible for monitoring student behavior, providing educational and social programming, and serving as role models. Six to eight RAs from each site were selected as participants for the study from a group of 12 to 18 possible participants. Those RAs who volunteered to participate in the study were then selected as participants based on the information gathered on a social membership form they were asked to complete. Information regarding the participants' gender, race, and sexual orientation was used to increase the diversity among participants.

RDs are professional staff members who also live in the college or university residence hall and are responsible for the training and supervision of the RAs. RDs servee as the second group of participants and facilitated the playing of the game. RDs were contacted directly by the researcher to assess their willingness to participate in the study. One RD was selected from each site to facilitate Collidascope with his or her own staff. A total of 14 to 18 participants was included in this study.

Setting

Participants were selected from two colleges in the northeast. One college is a private Ivy League institution, and the other a state college. The Ivy League institution has a high tuition cost, high entrance score requirements, and draws many of its students from out of state as well as internationally. Total undergraduate enrollment is 13,000 students. Fifty-two percent are men, and nearly 30 percent are people of color. This Ivy League institution has extremely active student organizations including a Black student union, Latino/a student union, and a gay, lesbian, and bisexual student alliance. The climate is often described as "politically correct," which

some interpret as taking "this diversity thing" too far. RAs receive extensive training on issues of diversity throughout the year. Understanding and valuing diversity is an important criteria in hiring RAs.

The state college has a lower tuition cost, students are accepted with lower entrance scores, and they are as likely to be from in state as elsewhere. Total undergraduate enrollment is 5,800 students. This state college has an active Black and Latino/a student union, and a less active gay, lesbian, and bisexual student organization. About 60 percent of those enrolled are women, and less than 3 percent are people of color. RA training on issues of diversity are focused primarily on racial issues, more specifically on Black and White issues. In the department of residence life, diversity training occurs a couple times a year. Beyond those trainings, any further education on these issues are left to the RD.

Access

I contacted the director of residence life at each of the two colleges. After explaining the study and obtaining consent to proceed with this research in their setting, I asked to consult the professional staff in residence life to identify RAs interested in participating in the study. I also asked that an introductory letter (see Appendix A) explaining the study be given to the RDs' entire staff as the first step in soliciting volunteers among the RAs. After reading this introductory letter, RAs who wanted to participate completed a Social Membership Profile Questionnaire (SMPQ) (see Appendix B). When a list of potential participants who expressed a desire to participate and completed the SMPQ was given to me by the residence director, I contacted these individuals personally to arrange for the other preliminary steps prior to final selection for this study.

Pilot Study

The use of a pilot study was helpful in gaining information used during the actual research study. A pilot study was conducted with seven participants to check the appropriateness and relevance of the structure and questions asked of participants in the interviews. These seven participants, all either residence directors or residence assistants, were asked about their experiences in playing Collidascope. The participants played the game for one hour, and in a group interview session afterward, the researcher asked them questions about their experience. With the help of participants, some questions were deleted and others added or changed, depending on how well these questions guided participants in relating their experience playing the game. In this pilot study the process was not identical to the way the research study was actually conducted. Rather it was used to solicit participants' thoughts about their experience of playing the game.

Research Design

Design methods, information-gathering forms, and questionnaires used in the game Collidascope are described in the following paragraphs.

Social Membership Profile Questionnaire and Purposeful Sampling Procedures

Consistent with the strategy of purposeful sampling, the final group of participants was selected by using the information provided in the Social Membership Profile Questionnaire. An effort was made to make the group of participants as diverse as possible, representing a wide range of social memberships by gender, race, and, if possible, sexual identity, as well as

including people who have dominant and target identity status within each social membership category.

Consent

After reviewing the letter of introduction, completing the Social Membership Profile Questionnaire, the participants spoke with me to address any concerns they may have had before committing themselves to the research study. Each was then given the consent form (see Appendix C), which outlined the purpose of the study, time commitment required, the participants' right to withdraw, and how the information would be used. Confidentiality and anonymity were also discussed, and participants were assigned identification numbers so their names would not be used during data analysis or in written products except for the initial matching of their name and number.

Interviews

Students and facilitators were interviewed before the game was played, immediately after the game was finished, one week, and one month later. The interviews occurred as follows:

1. Pregame individual interviews (60 minutes each)
2. Play game and observation (90 minutes)
3. Postgame group interview (30 minutes)
4. Follow-up individual interview one week later (60 minutes each)
5. Follow-up individual interview one month later (60 minutes each)

All game sessions and interviews were audiotaped, and the actual game playing was videotaped as well. Audiotaping and videotaping allowed the researcher the freedom to take observation notes rather than lengthy

note-taking. These notes made reference to participants' body language and other nonverbal behaviors an audiotape cannot record.

Journal

Participants were asked to keep a personal journal for one month after playing Collidascope. In the journal the students were to describe incidents in their day-to-day lives that were related to the game experience and what they learned playing the game. They were asked to write freely about any experience or thought that reminded them of the game itself or any of the issues covered in the game.

Data Collection

Data was collected using a social membership profile questionnaire, a series of four interviews with RAs and three interviews with RDs, RAs' and RDs' journals, researcher journals and notes, and field observation.

Pregame Individual Interviews

These initial interviews provided an understanding of each participant's knowledge and awareness of racism and heterosexism. This informal baseline helped to indicate any changes in awareness and knowledge after playing the game. These pregame interviews were conducted with facilitators as well as students (see Appendixes B and E).

Game Play and Observations

Each group of participants played Collidascope for 90 minutes, facilitated by the RDs. Only two of the six categories (racism and heterosexism) were used so that some depth in each topic could be achieved and to assure

consistency between the two participant groups from each of the two colleges. The researcher and RD facilitator met 30 to 45 minutes before playing the game to select the cards that were to be used during the game to assure that each of the learning styles in the situation category of the game was utilized. Using different learning style cards was important because participants were asked to process how the different learning modalities affected their experience.

This meeting between the researcher and the RD prior to the game also addressed any concerns the facilitator may have as well as issues such as the researcher's observer role, RAs' reactions to having the researcher in the room and their reaction to being videotaped, and the RDs' concerns about facilitating the game in front of the actual creator of the game (the researcher). The researcher was identified at the beginning of the game by the RD, whereupon I briefly explained the purpose of my study, my role during the game, and that I would be videotaping the game. I did not mention that in addition to being the researcher, I was also the creator of the game. Particular attention was focused on how students reacted to one another and their perceived level of safety and engagement with the activity. Observation notes described any nonverbal behavior.

Postgame Group Interview

The second, or postgame, group interview focused on participants' reactions to the game. Information pertaining to areas such as the game's usefulness, participants' level of engagement, and what worked well and what did not work well were sought. Facilitators also participated in this interview. More specific questions relating to their role as facilitator were asked during their individual follow-up interview (see Appendix F).

Follow-Up Interview One Week Later

The one-week period between playing the game and the third interview was intended to give students time to reflect on their experiences in playing the game. If the game experience evoked strong feelings for students, they would have time to think about why that happened. They would also be in a more distant position in time to judge for themselves whether any learning took place. This interview described what information and emotional reactions the participants retained from the game experience. These follow-up interviews were conducted with the facilitators as well as students (see Appendixes G and H).

Follow-Up Interview One Month Later

The purpose of this fourth and final interview with student participants was to discover whether any long-term changes in attitudes, awareness, or actions were identified by student participants that they attributed to playing the game (see Appendix G).

Facilitator Interviews

Two one-hour, open-ended interviews were conducted with each of the facilitators. The first interview with facilitators was similar to the initial interviews with the students and served as a pre-assessment (see Appendix E). It was conducted at least one week before the playing of the game and assessed the facilitators' base of knowledge about issues of diversity and social justice and about facilitating SJE activities. The second interview, conducted later, assessed the usefulness of the game and their role as facilitators (see Appendix H). Facilitators' perceptions of student involvement and what parts

of the game they thought were more and less stimulating was solicited during this time.

Field Observations

Observations were made during the actual playing of the game and the interviews that preceded and followed. The field notes from the game described interchanges, verbal and nonverbal, that were used when presenting results to enrich the description of the game experience from the perspective of nonparticipant observer.

Data Analysis

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) suggest that for the beginner researcher, data analysis should be a combination of "analysis-in-the-field" interwoven during data collection and a second, more formal and intensive analysis once data collection is complete. Ongoing analysis must be done as data are collected to identify tentative themes and to shift and adjust to themes that are developed through the interviewing process. This ongoing analysis allows the researcher to investigate and elaborate on these evolving themes with participants.

In this study, coding categories were developed using research questions as initial guides. Themes were developed by identifying words, phrases, behaviors, or perceptions repeated by participants and between the two settings (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Direct quotes from participants were used to illustrate these categories and themes, and definitions were provided to differentiate among them.

Trustworthiness Strategies

Since I am the developer of the game and researcher in this study, i identified strategies to address participant reactions and to monitor my own biases. The RAs were not told that I was cocreator of Collidascope. If the participants had known that the observer of the game was also the creator, they may have been less honest with their responses in an effort to please me. Therefore, I minimized this concern by not giving the information to the participants.

Steps must be taken to assure that there is a check and balance system in place so that biases by the researcher can be minimized. In this study, triangulation was used as a method of cross-checking the data. By interviewing participants and facilitators and by doing field observation, I could observe reactions to the game from different perspectives. And because I conducted several interviews over a period of time, my perceptions were checked with the participants in subsequent interviews.

A third method used to assure trustworthiness was to identify a peer debriefer. This person challenged my interpretation of data and served as a support system. I also kept a journal as a running record of my thoughts and perceptions. The journal had three parts: methodological, analytical, and personal. These three foci guided the process of monitoring my own biases.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter describes the reactions of participants and facilitators to the social justice education game, Collidascope. This game focused on increasing their knowledge and awareness of racism and heterosexism. Interviewing the participants revealed that a number of factors influenced their thoughts and feelings regarding diversity training. These influences were explored to understand how they may have affected the experience of using this particular game as a diversity training tool. These influences are discussed in the context of how they relate to the original research questions:

1. How did participants experience playing the game? Answers to these questions will be based on interview data regarding participants' perceptions, my observations during the playing of the game, and participants' journals.
2. How did playing the game influence the participants' knowledge, awareness, and actions regarding racism and heterosexism?

This chapter describes the results of the research project with regard to each research question. Included in this section is information relating to all of the interviews, game observations, journals, participants' perceptions, and any changes in behavior or awareness levels. In all sections, data are used from interviews with students, research observations during game play, or from the students' journals they were asked to write during the month

following game play. Specific data sources are mentioned only when necessary for greater understanding of the results.

What Students Brought to the Experience of Playing the Game

This diversity training experience of using the Collidascope game is only a small part of the participants' larger exposure to issues of diversity. The students were able to contrast their previous diversity experiences with that of playing the game. Previous experiences and training regarding issues of diversity had a clear influence on students' attitudes and knowledge levels. How those experiences influenced the students' perceptions may, in turn, have influenced some of their perceptions when playing the game.

A majority of students from both schools expressed similar feelings of fear, anger, stress, and anxiety at the thought of having to attend mandatory diversity training programs as part of their RA jobs: They were suspicious and cautious about playing the SJE game and, in particular, were skeptical and suspicious of the facilitators' intentions. Many of them were afraid the facilitators were going to try to make them feel guilty or blame them for all the prejudice in the world. Even students who expressed an overall positive attitude toward such trainings admitted feeling anxious at times. During their individual pregame interview, students discussed their previous formal diversity training and informal experiences relating to issues of diversity and the impact they had on them. They continued to describe how those experiences made them feel and how they influenced their perceptions of race and sexual orientation.

Previous Diversity Training or Experience

Most of the students did not have many experiences with formal diversity training. On average, students from both schools attended between one and three diversity training sessions and generally characterized these as somewhat helpful, boring, or anxiety producing. As a result, many students generalized the negative aspect of these experiences so that they believed all diversity trainings would be stressful and nonproductive. Though these few training sessions would not be considered very much formal training to many, the students felt their experience was extensive and that it was quite enough for their liking. Returning RAs particularly expressed resentment that they were forced to attend such trainings because they believed they had learned everything they needed to know about diversity during previous training sessions.

Overall, students from both schools were mixed as to whether they believed that the previous trainings changed their attitudes or behaviors. In general, students believed that in order for the training to be effective it had to be fun and not create conflict. Disagreement was perceived as a form of intolerance, as an unwillingness to try to understand the other person's perspective. Any attempts by the facilitators or other participants to challenge someone's perspective were seen as disruptive. Once again a contradiction emerged. Even trainings perceived as "bad" influenced the students. Though they recognized their anger immediately after this particular "bad" training, some believed they learned from it. When asked if any of their attitudes or behaviors had changed as a result of these trainings, most students said they did change.

> Oh yeah, I think that's changed the most. It's just that I think the result of the training, I think the trainings themselves were just something to initiate—they started me thinking, and then through conversations . . . helped me to really change my attitudes.
>
> Actually they have. It had a big impact on my life, because I started viewing everything a little differently and tried to apply what I'm learning in my classes and these simulations to the real world.

In stark contrast, a very few students indicated no change. As one said, "I'm pretty set in my ways."

Regardless of the experience, the overall impact of the students' previous trainings influenced the attitudes they brought when playing Collidascope. Students' attitudes when entering a diversity training often set a tone that can help or hinder training efforts. Not all their perceptions were shaped solely by their previous training experiences, but these sessions did account for many of their incoming perceptions.

Description of Public College versus Private University Participants

The Public College. I will use the categories of the public college and the private university as a way to organize the two samples used in the study. No differences between the two institutions appeared in the study, which could be attributed to their status as public or private institutions.

The public college had ten participants, including one facilitator: three White men, six White women, and one African American woman. During the pregame interviews at the public college, most of the participants commented on two in-service trainings in which they had participated during that semester. Students labeled one session the "bad" training and referred to the other as the "good" training. Although participants at the private university had feelings about past training sessions, theirs were not as

intense as the feelings of the students at the public college. The in-service labeled as "bad" by students centered around three subtopics: (a) student descriptions of how they experienced the training, (b) reactions to that experience, and (c) reasons they did not like the trainer or training. The anger, caution, defensiveness, and fear expressed during the pregame interviews were rooted for many students in the "bad" training experience.

> The first one was a brawl, literally, . . . just pointing fingers of who's to blame.
>
> [The training session] was like sort of violent, and a bunch of aggression, and people venting.

Most of the students felt stress and tension during this training and as a result felt threatened or hesitant to speak. This stress and tension compounded the resistance of what was already a fairly resistant group.

> At first I felt pressure to be quiet, then I wanted to say something, and I was afraid to say it too, but I did.
>
> I just sat back and was quiet. . . . I really didn't feel the need to get myself involved.

Both of the facilitators were Black women. White students often commented on the first "bad" facilitator in a personal way. Responsibility for the outcome of the in-service was placed solely on the facilitator. Comments from the White students included the following:

> Considering she's the multicultural coordinator, I have a real problem with the fact that she only discusses Black and White issues. . . . She doesn't seem to really do anything for the Jewish students, the Asian students, gay and lesbian students, so it just got a little out of hand.

> During orientation we had to go to a diversity session, which was a horrible mistake for everyone. It was a mandatory thing, and the facilitator brought a lot of her own prejudices in.

The only exception of students "blaming" the facilitator for a "bad" session was the one woman of color who said that she thought the facilitator did a good job but that the students just were not developmentally ready.

Two factors led to what the students perceived as the successful ("good") diversity training. First, students felt more comfortable with the second facilitator because of her style; they did not feel defensive as in the first training.

> I felt like [in] the first [training session] all of us were being accused of doing something—I just felt very put on the defensive. . . . The second time she just came in with the idea that there are a lot of things that everyone doesn't know, Black, White, or otherwise, and went from that point, kind of helped us to see it together, and work at it like that, instead of separating us from the beginning, which is the way I felt from the other one.
>
> The first one, I was angry and confused. The second one was much more positive; it made us all, it made me feel that I had more direction. It was very self-affirming.

The second factor was that the presenter in the second workshop solicited students' input more, and students felt her style was more participatory. This inclusion was significant in students' perceptions of a successful training session. Students did not enjoy diversity training when they did not have the opportunity to speak.

> The first one—she basically talked to us at first, and it was more her talking and us listening, and then the other lady got us involved right from the beginning. She was, like, What do you think? . . . She wanted us to get involved.

> I liked the way the woman did it the second time, more participatory and not putting anyone on the defensive.

The Private University. There were seven participants at the private university, including one facilitator. The group consisted of three White men (one who is gay), one African American woman, one Latina, and two East Indian men. Since many of the RAs in this group were newly hired, in contrast to the mostly returning RAs at the public college, they had little previous diversity training experience. The climate at their university regarding diversity issues was more of an influence for these students. The private university had a much more diverse student population that necessitated the university community to deal with issues such as race and sexual orientation. At the time the pregame interviews were being conducted, the campus was caught in a firestorm of controversy about such issues as first amendment rights, wanting their own living and learning residence halls for both the Latina/o students and gay, lesbian, and bisexual students. Students at this university were very aware of the climate surrounding them and felt pressure to comply with expectations that they be culturally sensitive to all of the students living on their floors. The RAs' perceptions of diversity trainings were strongly influenced by this campus climate, and they felt pressure to be "politically correct." This pressure to be "PC" will be discussed at length in the next section.

Interaction with Different Social Membership Groups

In-service training programs were not the only influence on students' perspectives on diversity issues before playing the game. Half of the students described other events in their lives that influenced their own perceptions of

racism. An important factor for many when dealing with their own racism was the level of interaction they had with other racial groups. Many of the students felt that the more interaction they had with students who were different from them racially, the more comfortable they felt. Though many of the White students expressed more comfort with people of color as their interaction with them increased, these same White students expressed discomfort with people of color if there were "too many" of them together at one time. This contradiction was not obvious to the students. Many of the White students interpreted feeling comfortable with people of color as not being racist, a label they tried hard to avoid. When they were pushed out of their comfort zone, however, such as when there were "too many" people of color, they did not describe this discomfort as racist.

At the public college, when asked about interactions with people who differed from them racially, the White students limited their stories primarily to the people of color on their staff; they had limited experiences with people of color other than those with whom they worked. Students from the private university had broader experiences and were exposed to a more racially diverse student population than students from the public college. (In fact, four more people of color participated in the study at the private university than at the public college, even though the study at the university had fewer participants than the public college.) The larger institution's greater diversity could account for the difference in racial attitudes between the two populations. Students from the private university did not express the depth of anger and defensiveness regarding racism as did the White students from the public college. Their comments describing outside events that influenced their racial attitudes illustrated some of these perceptions.

One White male student spoke of his experience staying on a Navajo reservation when he was a child: "I would say that experience changed my life entirely about my attitude towards culture and different people. They chose to accept us; they did have a choice whether to accept us or not." Three of the White men, however, spoke of more recent interactions with people of color which resulted in anger:

> Like, somebody who is African American beats me at the dribble [in basketball], then people on the sidelines say, "Oh, white boy, white boy can't move," and that, to me, that's racism, that's the same thing. Maybe it's not the same thing as being shoved in a ghetto all your life, but it's the same feeling."

Feelings about Diversity Training

Students from both the private university and the public college experienced similar feelings and attitudes entering the pre-interviews. Students from both institutions expressed concerns about being "politically correct" or bored, about feeling defensive, and about saying or doing the wrong thing in the diversity trainings.

Many students from both schools associated the word diversity with stress, conflict, and feeling defensive. Past experiences with diversity training left many of them defensive and feeling personally responsible for prejudice and social injustice. Feeling blamed created resistance to diversity education. Such sentiments are expressed by these students' comments:

> I start to feel guilty, like I'm doing something wrong. . . . You get caught up in defending yourself.

> It makes me very frustrated and very tense about the issue, a lot of stagnant, not going anywhere and talking about the issues, kind of just getting stuck on just talking about problems and not finding solutions.

Concerns about Political Correctness in Diversity Training

Students were concerned about being judged for not behaving in the "correct" manner. They feared reprimands for not saying or doing the "expected" things. Political correctness, in their perceptions, had become an expectation of their roles as RAs. This tension created a cautious climate for some who were so intimidated that they often opted not to say anything during other diversity sessions. For others, it created anger and resentment, because they felt these sessions were meant to change them and what they believe. Some students expressed it this way:

> I panic because I've always found it a touchy subject to deal with, and for someone to say they're going to train you. . . what attitudes should I have. Are they going to try to change what I think?

> I was told that basically I had to turn around the way I was brought up for the past 18 years and think of [diversity], which I had a big problem with.

Political correctness had become one of the biggest obstacles to overcome when dealing with the students' attitudes and perceptions of diversity and diversity training. Though students at the private university expressed more concerns about the pressure of dealing with political correctness, it was a prominent issue with the students from the public college as well. The contradiction in this case is that the very training that was supposed to aid students in discussing issues of diversity more freely was actually hindered by participants' perceptions of political correctness.

Only a few students were more neutral or positive in their feelings about diversity, a surprising finding, considering that awareness of diversity issues is a major hiring consideration for RAs at both institutions. Though some students did have some positive comments regarding their feelings

about diversity and their previous experience, they were clearly in the minority. "Overall I think [diversity trainings] do more good than harm. . . . For the main part they're quite informative and more good."

Knowledge and Comfort Level Preassessments

Before playing Collidascope, students were asked to evaluate themselves, on a scale of 1 to 5, on their knowledge and comfort levels of racism and heterosexism. The scales are represented below.

> Please place yourself on the information scale regarding racism/ heterosexism.
>
> 1 = no information/knowledge
> 2 = little information/knowledge
> 3 = some information/knowledge
> 4 = fair amount of information/knowledge
> 5 = advanced amount of information/knowledge
>
> Please place yourself on the feeling scale regarding the following issues:
>
> 1 = I feel extremely uncomfortable with [people of color/gay, lesbian, and bisexual people].
> 2 = I feel uncomfortable with _____ people.
> 3 = I feel somewhat comfortable with _____ people.
> 4 = I feel comfortable with _____ people.
> 5 = I feel very comfortable with _____ people.

Students at both institutions overestimated their own levels of knowledge and comfort regarding racism and heterosexism. They tended to evaluate themselves as 4s or 5s in both knowledge of racism and comfort with people racially different. When discussing heterosexism, most students evaluated themselves lower than they did in racism, averaging between 2 and 4 on both the information and feeling scales. Although these self-evaluation scores were lower than in racism, they nevertheless were overestimates, based on what the students discussed during the interviews. For example,

many students said they felt comfortable with certain groups but would then describe actions or attitudes that contradicted their own assessment.

Racism Assessment

Both sets of students, who were predominantly White, seemed to have rated themselves higher than their behavior and statements warranted. One student rated herself a 3 on the information scale (some information) and a 4 on the feeling scale (comfortable with people of color). In contrast, she had this to say regarding racism training:

> It got me angry. I'm just going to talk about, like, Blacks: they spend too much time walking around saying that they want to be equal and this and that, yet there are so many times they try to divide themselves and, like, exclude. . . . I'm not racist, but you guys are pushing me very close to the point of where I feel I should be.

One consistent theme was that the students rated themselves very low on the information and feelings scales as first-year students. The ratings were predominantly scored around 1–2 for information regarding racism (no to little information). All but one of the students reported significant increases in their knowledge regarding racism after the first year. They attributed most of this growth to the training they received as RAs, to their courses, and to interacting with people from a different racial background.

Another common theme regarding the feeling scale or comfort level, particularly among the White students, was that their comfort level was determined by how many people of color were present. The smaller the number of people of color, the higher the level of comfort; the higher the number, the lower the level of comfort.

> I would be somewhat uncomfortable in a group, but, like, when I'm around one or two it doesn't even faze me.
>
> What I see all the time is this big grouping of colored people and White people. I feel comfortable on a one-on-one or one-on-two basis, but when the numbers start accumulating, I don't feel comfortable, I don't feel they want me there, for one thing.
>
> Let's take, for instance, a handshake, which I've noticed here a lot. I go to shake someone's hand, and I don't know what they're doing. That's all right and all, it's different, and it's fun, but when I do it on a one-to-one situation, that's one thing, but when there are 60 people doing something I don't know, I don't like it.

Some of the students indirectly referred to the lack of trust they have for people of a different racial group. This included students of color as well as White students.

> I don't feel totally comfortable [with White people]. I don't think I could open up to them and tell them all my problems per se because I don't know if they would understand them and understand what I'm going through.
>
> [When I went to Black Student Union], the tables were turned. I was one of a very few White students in there. My motives were being questioned at all times.

Heterosexism Assessment

Students did not assess themselves as high on gay, lesbian, and bisexual information levels as they did on issues of race. They rated themselves at 0–1 (little to no information) as first-year students. They were less likely to get information regarding gays, lesbians, and bisexuals in training sessions and were more likely to gain information through personal contact and experiences. The most significant experience, described by nearly half of the students, was having someone "come out" to them. In all of the examples

given, students experienced a positive interaction that later shaped their perceptions of other gay, lesbian, or bisexual people.

> My father worked for a homosexual. He was the funniest guy I've ever seen, a great guy, a nice guy. He joked around, like we never even knew that he was homosexual, then when we found out, we still didn't change our attitude about him because he established himself first as someone that was cool and fun. But if we knew he was homosexual first, I think we would have shunned him out.

Most of the students rated themselves as feeling comfortable with gay, lesbian, and bisexual people. They noted the comfort level had increased significantly since they entered college and cited two factors that most contributed to this increase: training on the issue and contact with gay, lesbian, or bisexual people.

The students who did receive was training credited it for their attitudinal and behavioral changes regarding gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues. As their level of information increased, so did their level of comfort.

> The more I know, the more I am comfortable with [gay issues], and the more I want to change it. . . . It's just as much of an issue as racism.

> It helped me because I had a resident come to me and express that he was a homosexual, and, to be perfectly honest, before all this I would have been terrified.

Another factor that increased students' level of comfort regarding gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues was the level of direct personal contact they had with gays, lesbians, or bisexuals. Many had believed most of the stereotypes and then concluded that they didn't know any, so it wasn't an issue with which they concerned themselves.

> Through the RA programming, they had all these activities, and I was a little uncomfortable with it, I was a little unsure of it, but as I got to know people and I had friends I didn't know were gay and then I found out they were, I realized there's no difference, they're still the same person.
>
> I think I'm more comfortable, I guess, with lesbian women, possibly because I have a lesbian friend and I've just dealt with her and see what she's like. And then I have two gay cousins.

The Double Standard: Not Good to Be Racist, Not Bad to Be Homophobic

The clearest theme relating to the gay, lesbian, and bisexual topic centered around factors that make the students uncomfortable. They were more at ease talking about this discomfort than they were about their discomfort with racism. When discussing racism, students tended to get defensive or angry at the implication that they might be racist. Their energy was spent warding off such attacks. This defensiveness was reflected in their body language during the pregame interview, at which they tended to be more cautious with their language and how they worded their thoughts. Sometimes they seemed to be seeking approval by making eye contact or nodding their heads before making a statement that might be perceived as racist. Or they would ask, "Do you know what I mean?" which I interpreted as, "Don't you agree?" When speaking about their discomfort relating to heterosexism, however, students seemed comfortable and casual. Their energy was focused on making sure that people did not perceive them to be gay, lesbian, or bisexual. They went to great lengths to ward off such implications.

Students observed that in their everyday life, peer pressure was very influential in maintaining this homophobic attitude. When racist jokes or comments were made, students demonstrated disapproval by either

confronting the remarks or participating passively with nervous laughter or by doing nothing. Homophobic jokes or comments were greeted with boisterous laughter and active participation. Students would comment that one joke would often lead to another homophobic joke. When asked about this difference, students attributed it to the way the rest of society feels about these two groups; for the most part it was acceptable to be homophobic but not to be racist.

The two most common fears among students were being approached or desired sexually by a gay, lesbian, or bisexual individual or being perceived by others as gay, lesbian, or bisexual. No matter how intellectually sophisticated the students were, during the interviews most of them still struggled with the stereotype that gay, lesbian, or bisexual people are sexually aggressive. Without a doubt, this was the most common concern affecting the students' level of comfort, although the students quoted in this section all rated themselves either a 4 (comfortable) or 5 (very comfortable) on the comfort scale with gay, lesbian, or bisexual people. When asked about this contradiction between their behaviors and self-ratings, the students qualified it by saying that it really depended on the setting or the situation. When asked what might make them feel uncomfortable around gay, lesbian, or bisexual people, the students responded, "If I were approached"; "I might fear this person is going to rape me"; "I guess I'm still fighting the fact that if someone is a lesbian and you're a female, that they're looking at you in a certain way."

The other biggest fear students had concerning heterosexism was guilt by association. Students did not want to be seen with people who were gay, lesbian, or bisexual or to be perceived as gay, lesbian, or bisexual. This fear most often altered their behavior and was inconsistent with how they confronted racism. One White student gave an example of how some of his

White teammates were teasing him for hanging out with some of the Black players. This angered him so much that he reduced the amount of time spent with his White teammates because he thought them to be bigots. When asked to create a parallel scenario regarding homophobia, the student said he would stop hanging out with his teammate if the teammate were gay. He said of this contradiction:

> I see what you're saying; you're bringing up an important point. It seems like there's kind of a double standard going here. There's a different feeling between diversity in sex and race. Race is okay now, but now when it comes to sex, I guess I would say I'm very biased towards homosexuals.

Even when confronted with glaring contradictions regarding their double standard between addressing racism and heterosexism, students did not seem to object to being perceived as homophobic. The student who made the above statement rated himself between a 4 and a 5 on the comfort scale regarding gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. He acknowledged the inconsistency between his attitude toward Blacks and gays, lesbians, and bisexuals but responded with a simple shrug of his shoulders. Although students continually identified themselves as being open and accepting of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, the examples they provided about their open attitudes were more often examples of their homophobia. The students did not see these contradictions, demonstrating their inaccurate perception of their own developmental level regarding heterosexism. Two examples illustrate this.

One woman who rated herself a 5 (feeling very comfortable with gays, lesbians, and bisexuals) spoke of the risk of being seen with her lesbian friend: "I've been places with her a million times now, and it just crossed my mind,

because somebody looked up and I knew someone knew her but wasn't sure who I was, so I was just wondering what he was thinking."

A male student, who also rated himself a 5 on the comfort scale, could not bring himself to tell his friends about his roommate.

> There are still some of my friends from high school that I haven't told I had a gay roommate last year, because they wouldn't be able to deal with it. I don't know why, but they totally bought into, for whatever reasons, insecure about their own masculinity.

As in the racism category, students began to feel discomfort when there were several gays, lesbians, or bisexuals around them. When asked if they felt discomfort only when the number of gays, lesbians, or bisexuals outnumbered them, most students said no, they didn't have to be the majority to feel comfortable. But they said there just had to be several who identified as gay, lesbian, or bisexual and were "visible" for them to feel uncomfortable.

When asked to explain how a gay, lesbian, or bisexual would be considered "visible," some students made hand gestures of a limp wrist. they would experience high levels of anxiety around people whose behavior they labeled as blatant. Students explained blatant behavior as public displays of affection (kissing, holding hands), acting in a stereotypic gay way (walking or talking in a certain effeminate manner), or talking about gay issues. Similar types of hand gestures and stereotypical gay gestures were also played out during the game when students were asked to participate in certain gay role plays. Similar displays of affection by heterosexuals, however, were not considered blatant unless they were taken to the extreme. Once again a double standard was imposed on gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. One student said, "I

guess what I feel uncomfortable about is them showing their affection or putting it in your face. That's what would make me feel uncomfortable."

Social Identities

A third of the students commented on the frustrations or influences that their social identity had when discussing issues of diversity. Some students, particularly the White students, felt that they were not given the benefit of the doubt and that their feelings were not given the same consideration as students of color. White males in particular felt strongly that they were experiencing some reverse discrimination as a direct result of diversity education. Some of these White males said they didn't like going to diversity training because others would try to blame all the social injustice on them simply because of their social identity. One White male said, "I start to feel insecure a lot of times. . . . That whole thing bothers me, because I don't think it's fair. . . . I'm being stereotyped, just like people accuse me of doing. Just because they're White men they're not necessarily evil." Another student talked about his experience of being a second-generation Indian man and the struggle of being caught in two worlds: "One of the struggles I personally have gone through is because my parents were immigrants, . . . I'm the second generation, and I'm caught between two cultures."

Peer or Parental Pressure

Peer or parental pressure sometimes made the students alter their behaviors regarding racism. At the public college, the majority of the White students talked about the dilemma they had experienced as to whether they should go to the Black Student Union (BSU) meetings. Most of them attended at least one of the meetings because they wanted the only Black RA

to know that they cared and they did not want to be perceived as racist by not going. These feelings of peer pressure were likely interwoven with an element of pressure to be politically correct. Once again, the White students were very conscious of their image and wanted the students of color to see them as allies. All of them, however, reported feeling uncomfortable and questioning whether they should be at the meeting. Some were angered by what they thought was a lack of graciousness demonstrated by the students of color and were offended and hurt when it became clear that the White students would not be invited to attend all of the meetings.

The pressure the White students felt to attend the BSU meetings was one example of peer pressure. At the private university, one student spoke of covert pressure. A Latina said:

> Like, just today we had to pick bulletin boards we have to do, and I had the choice of picking between Black history and anti-Semitism, and I was, like, okay, I would probably enjoy anti-Semitism more because it would be, like, just doing it and researching it, and it wouldn't be that much pressure. But I chose Black history because of what others might think.

Others spoke about pressures from family or close friends. Some found family and friends hardest to confront about issues of diversity. It was easier for them not to say anything or not to disagree with others than to speak their minds. Though developmentally the Latina woman quoted above had progressed to the point of understanding how racism has consequences for her, she wass pulled back by forces that test her loyalty. A White woman expressed the same concern:

> In my family [interracial dating] would not be taken very well at all. I was very interested, and I would have liked to pursue it, but I didn't want to get involved, knowing that it would end up hurting him, or

> get involved with him knowing my parents would freak, especially my father. I don't want to totally alienate myself from my family. It bothers me, because it limits me.

It was clear from the information the students shared during the pregame interviews that many of them felt pressure when entering diversity training sessions. Many brought with them negative expectations of the Collidascope experience because of their past diversity training experiences. They felt as though they had to hide these negative expectations from others, especially the facilitators. This pressure to conceal their feelings was increased because of their roles as RAs. Many students thought their jobs as RAs would be jeopardized if they did not respond in the expected manner or that their personal reputation would be tarnished if their peers saw them as anything but open-minded. Clearly, the students' previous experience and social identities influenced how they experienced the game.

Playing the Game

Many aspects of the game itself are important in understanding its effects on these student participants. The game accommodates various preferred learning styles. Its variation of small group - large group structure allow students a safe environment in which to share their views. Time limitations for playing the game constrain the amount of learning possible. And playing the game competitively or cooperatively leads to possible different dynamics and outcomes.

Game Observations

The tone of each of the groups playing the game was quite different. The public college group was high energy and engaging. They were very

physical with one another, often hugging or giving each other a "high five." Their body postures demonstrated that they were interested in what the other person was saying as they leaned toward the person speaking. Eye contact was high, and there was much nodding of heads and other affirming gestures. And their joking and laughing bonded the students, particularly at stressful times. The students appeared to be enjoying themselves while also engaging in passionate and conflicting dialogue.

The tone with the private university students, however, was completely different. Students here played thirty minutes less than the public college group, and there were several periods of silence, apparently because no one wanted to initiate or engage in dialogue. The energy level was very low, and students made obvious gestures to one another in an effort to encourage dialogue. Head nods, hand gestures, or eye contact were used to direct another student to speak when asked by the facilitator. At times, students at the private university showed little interest in the dialogue, playing with their shoelaces or eating doughnuts as a distraction. There was no physical contact between players and a noticeably low level of joking and laughing among the group. Students appeared bored several times throughout the game. The students at the private university did not engage in side conversations while the game was being played, while at the public college side conversations occurred because students had more they wanted to say but time would not allow it. The facilitator at the private university worked much harder at soliciting participation in contrast to his colleague from the public college. Overall, students at the private university appeared to be going through the motions of participating in a study and appeared to take, or give, little to the experience.

Several factors may have influenced how each of the groups experienced the game: size of the playing group, participants' relationship with each other, and the difference in facilitators. The difference in group size was a function of differences in how each of the institutions conducted their RA training. The public college trained new and returning RAs as a single group. The private university separated the new RAs from the returning RAs, resulting in a smaller number of participants for this study. This size difference was the most significant difference between the two groups. The public college played the game with approximately 25–30 participants, most of whom were not formally part of the study. At the private university, only six research participants played. One might expect the conversation to be more intimate with a smaller group, but this was not the case.

The participants' relationships also differed during the group interviews. At the public college the students were on the same staff, and their interaction was more engaging, more emotionally involved. They would cite more personal examples and share stories that influenced their way of thinking. They exhibited a range of feelings, including anger, tension, sensitivity, and joviality, and students appeared comfortable in taking risks by personal sharing. Students' body language demonstrated interest in the conversation. Even when one student expressed anger about the experience, other students questioned her, staying involved instead of tuning out. Students discussed their feelings more than they discussed the information they learned.

Students from the private university, in contrast, focused on the actual informational content of the game. When asked how certain dilemmas influenced them, most often students would tell of the intellectual conflict they may have experienced. Expressions of emotions were rare and were kept

at a safe and steady level. Only when they were asked to recall a time in their life when they were aware of their color did students speak from a personal level. One possible explanation for the emphasis on intellect rather than emotions could be the low level of trust and safety among the private university group, which could have occurred because the students did not know one another before playing the game.

Another consideration in how the students interacted were the facilitators. Both facilitators were White male resident directors (RDs). Both had been through a comparable number of social justice trainings previously to facilitating the game and had conducted social justice trainings themselves. The RD from the public college, however, facilitated the game with his staff, so he had a high level of trust and credibility. He also seemed more at ease with the students and used humor. The RD from the private university had a random sample of RAs playing the game, only two of whom were from his staff. He was much more nervous and cautious entering the game. Students may have reacted to the tone set by the facilitators.

What was consistent between both groups was the tone set at the beginning of the game, which remained throughout the entire game and into the group interview afterward. The public college group's tone was one of high energy and participation. The private university was a much lower level of participation.

Accommodation of Several Learning Styles

The various learning style modalities built into the game (e.g., debate, visualization, role play, respond, list, and recall) affected students differently, based primarily on their own individual learning style preference. Of the fifteen students who participated, nine found the debates to be most effective.

Almost every student was able to recall the debate situation card more than any other. The content on this card asked students to debate interracial adoption, or, more specifically, whether White parents should be able to adopt a child of color. Emotions ran high during this debate. Voices grew louder and more insistent. Nonverbal behavior was also more obvious than in other situations. People sat with arms folded, or they sat on the edge of their seats, and there were many side comments during the discussion of this card. One participant said, "I think that the most effective one is the debate. If you have two sides and then . . . you hear the other person, they have some good points too, so you start questioning yourself and it makes you think." Another responded to the debate this way:

> [The debates] were probably the best out of all of them 'cause you had to keep listening to what they say, change what you're thinking in your head and keep going if you wanted to. I kept changing my mind every time I heard the other side . . . made me think that I didn't think it as through as well. That probably taught me to think the most.

The remaining six students found the visualization to be the most effective situation card. White students were asked to visualize a place where Whites were in the minority, where people stared at them and made assumptions about them because they were White. Most of these students spoke of how they never really considered what it might be like to be a person of color. Though these White students evaluated themselves fairly high on the continuum of racism knowledge and comfort level, they had never considered a role reversal of this kind. Such a role reversal would usually occur early on in their racial developmental process, indicating an over-assessment of their knowledge and comfort level. Here are two examples of students reassessing their knowledge and comfort levels after the game:

> One of [the questions]—I never really actually thought about it—was we had to put ourselves, as a White Caucasian, to put yourself in a position where you're, that you notice that you are White as a minority. You don't really think of it like that way. . . . That question kind of stopped me.
>
> I think it was beneficial because every different one made you look at something differently. I know the thing where you were imagining you were White and all your friends, you know, that was more emotional. It totally hit home for me, like it was a personal thing instead of, you know, trying to work with a group or something. I think it stuck because I never really been asked that before. I have never been asked to be put in that situation.

The split in preferences between the debate card and the visualization card is symptomatic of the conflict between analytical learning, or head knowledge, and experiential, or heart, learning. The different learning styles were included to address both the head and the heart in all of the participants with the assumption that true learning takes place when both are combined.

Several White students at the public college made connections with the woman of color playing the game. Their level of empathy increased as a result of this visualization. Instead of placing the students in a more typical scenario where racial differences might separate people, students were asked to join and be on the same side. White students were to visualize what it might be like to be a student of color on this campus. They were not placed in a situation where they had to defend themselves. Students were better able to experience the scenario in their hearts rather than creating division in their heads.

> It was a visualization, where the White person was going to a Black college and was treated as the sense that we, the white person was a quota and the only reason why, you're asked a question, was to give the White point of view. They didn't want to know your intellectual point of view; they just wanted to generalize and say that you represent the

> White culture. At the end of the question it says, "OK, discuss how you feel." I turned to [Mary], who was Black, and I looked and I said, "Jesus, I feel black."
>
> I think visualizing, remembering when I felt White made me grow closer to her, because I might not live it every day, but she lives it every day."

I was curious about how the people of color experienced this visualization. Since the purpose of this card was to get the White people in touch with their own racism, I wondered if the people of color would find it useful or engaging. All of the students of color in this study were able to relate to this visualization in some manner and felt supported because it reflected their own experience but no one really listens to them. The Black students found this card to be very close to their experience, while the Latina and East Indian students could identify with the scenario occasionally. When one Black woman was asked how she experienced this visualization, she said it was very close to what she experiences daily: "I just sat back and listened to see, you know, I just listened really to see if what they were feeling was what I feel every day. It was."

Students of color were asked how they would have experienced playing the game if their target identity had not been focused on. These students seemed more involved when their particular oppression was being discussed. Their approach to their role in the group also changed at times, depending on whether or not they were part of the target group or the dominant group.

> I would be less active. I'd just sit back and listen because being that I'm in the dominant group, I would want to know, am I saying something wrong? Am I doing something wrong? I would just listen. I wouldn't say anything about it.

When we moved from racism to heterosexism, this particular student did exactly that. She became much less involved verbally in the discussions involving heterosexism; she took a more passive approach of "I don't know much about this so teach me." She resented the White students taking this same approach when discussing issues of race. Her nonverbal behavior was also more distant when discussing heterosexism. At one point she left the room. At other times she sat back and sucked her thumb. She did not appear to use her experience as a Black woman to better understand heterosexism.

Students from the two institutions varied greatly in what they remembered most about the experience after one week. More than half the public college students consistently remembered a racism situation card, which had them debating whether White parents should be able to adopt children of color. The remaining students were less specific in their response to what they remembered most from playing the game.

> I found myself debating the same things again or talking, or like new people, like when my suitemate came back, I was telling her about the game and we ended up having the same discussions. So probably just that the discussions taught me a lot.

> Just that it was original and how we addressed different issues and stuff. That we got to do role playing, we got to do debates, we had to come up with a different plan of action in different case scenarios and stuff.

Students from the private university were not as detailed about recalling their experience. Most recalled how they experienced the game instead of the actual cards themselves. Of the cards students were able to recall, they remembered a gay-related situation card the most after one week. Two students mentioned the racism situation card as the one they remembered most.

> The experience was okay. It was fun. It was nice trying to put myself in another person's position. So, there was nothing special about it, but it was fun. It was enjoyable.
>
> I thought it was interesting—more interesting than I thought it would be.
>
> I'd say it would border a little boring. . . . I just did not appreciate it. It was, you know, like artificial.

One month after playing the game students remembered about the same amount as they did after one week. With the exception of two students, participants were not able to recall any of the fact cards. Students said they found the fact cards interesting but doubted they would have been able to recall the fact cards at any point after the game. Everyone was able to recall at least two of the situation cards. Students were able to discuss these situations at some length during the game, which may have increased the likelihood of their remembering.

Of the situation cards, students recalled the debate cards most often. All of the learning styles found in the various situation cards were mentioned by at least one of the students as one they remembered the most. Other situation cards they remembered were role plays, make a list, create a plan, and visualization situation cards were all remembered.

When asked what they remembered about playing the game, students were more likely to recall actual situation cards rather than identifying their feelings during the game. At interviews one week later, students commented on their feelings more readily than after one month. I was somewhat surprised by this development because I would have guessed that actual details would be lost with the passage of time, but feelings would be easier to recall.

Two-Group System of Game Format

Nearly half of the students commented on the two-group system used in the game. Students would be placed in smaller teams of three to six when preparing to respond to a fact card or a situation card. Once this preparation was completed, the smaller teams would join the entire group to share their response to the situation card and engage in follow-up discussion.

First, students felt the smaller group size gave each of them an opportunity to express their thoughts and feelings without feeling threatened which caters to individual learning styles. Though many training sessions are conducted in large groups, these students suggested that many students would benefit if facilitators created opportunities for more small-group interaction.

> In the small teams it was easier to be more open because you had a smaller group to deal with; for myself, that's how it works. There was a chance to express myself. . . . It felt great. . . . The small group was great. Because we were dealing with one perspective in the small groups—the large group gave us a chance to look at another perspective and that was valuable.
>
> In this game, you even get broken down into your small groups, and that's probably where you learn the most. . . . So you learn a lot more 'cause people keep talking and keep bringing up different things, you know.

A second benefit of the small group–large group system evolved from students' concern about the possibility of hurting others' feelings or having their comments misunderstood. Many of the students identified concerns about safety as a primary factor when choosing how much self-disclosure to make during the game. With the smaller groups, students felt they had an opportunity to explain their comments, limiting the amount of misperception that might occur in the large group. Therefore, they talked

more in the smaller groups. In the larger group, however, some students would be cautious about their remarks or withhold their remarks altogether out of fear that their remarks might be misconstrued.

> Well, the smaller groups were easier, a lot easier to say what you felt and you didn't feel threatened. I personally feel threatened in a large group, so I kind of backed off a little.
>
> Disadvantages: it might make people more disliking of another person once they see that they have this kind of values or something, plus a person might screw up and say something they don't really mean and, you know, someone else might perceive that as how they really are.

Time Limitations

Without question, time was the limitation of the game students mentioned most. Students said there was not enough time to fully discuss everything they wanted to talk about. At times they would feel cut off by the facilitator's effort to keep the game moving by going onto the next situation. More than half the students acknowledged the time element as the most limiting part of the game.

> Games have to be played for a long time for us to deal with a lot of issues. But I like that although it's a limitation to the game, it's a limitation I like because it allows one to deal with specifics.

Competition

Competition was another game factor on which the students' perceptions were split. The game can be played in a competitive or a noncompetitive way. The facilitators and I decided to play the game in a noncompetitive way. Although the students only played the noncompetitive way, they were asked what impact playing competitively might have had on the effectiveness of the experience. The split came along gender lines. Of the

people who stated that they enjoyed or preferred the competitive element, all but one were men. Five of the six males would have preferred playing competitively. Several men stated that they even kept an unofficial scorecard in their heads of who was winning. Eight of the female students stated that they preferred to play in the noncompetitive mode.

Nonetheless, informal competition played a part in this experience. There were primarily three schools of thought involving the element of competition. One group felt the competitive element was instrumental in keeping participants' attention, others did not believe that anyone really cared about the score, and still others believed that people might have altered their answers in an effort to win. Three examples of the different beliefs around competition are seen in the quotes below.

> I think just because we were broken into groups there's naturally a competitiveness—it's inherent. And since our group answered every question right (Yeah!) and there were a couple of groups that were screwing up. . . . Yeah, I think there was mental scoring going on there. I was keeping score anyway, so it was good playing competitively. We were up 3-2, I think. [male respondent]

> Playing the way that we did lends itself more to learning . . . a little more relaxed. If it was competitive, we would have been focusing on that a little more than we should and not as much on actually what we were talking about it. [female respondent]

> I think when you turn it into a competition some people tend to maybe lose the whole point a little bit. Like guys. [female respondent]

Students reacted differently to the variations contained within the game format. While certain elements of the game aided some students in their learning process, it hindered others. This varied format influenced what students remembered most about their experience of playing the game.

How Students Compared the Game with Other Diversity Training Approaches

Most of the students in both groups found the experience of playing this diversity game much more effective and enjoyable than most of the previous diversity trainings they had experienced. Having the opportunity to discuss the issues openly and interactively was the most frequent reason given for having such a positive experience. Students felt more in control of the experience and it felt more concrete or real to them. As a result, they engaged in a higher level of participation, which led to their desire to discuss the issue at hand even after the facilitator requested that the group move on.

Although students had covered similar topics in previous training sessions, they felt that this game made them consider these same topics in a different way. Too many of the previous training sessions felt repetitive for the students and so many of them entered the session with a negative attitude.

> I learned something new. The workshops have become repetitive, and you say the same thing, and it's like, let's go a little further, so this is like a different way. And I think that's good.

> Before the game, I would be just, like, anytime someone brought up multiculturalism, for instance, I'd be, like, "not again," just "let's not go into this again." But because that was a really positive situation, I'm more open to it now.

Students consistently mentioned that in most of their previous experience with diversity training the format was basically a lecture format. Many of the students were frustrated by that format because they felt they were not encouraged to participate and speak their mind, they found at times to be condescending. Because they felt talked down to, students would often

tune out what the facilitator was saying. The students also wanted to have the opportunity to learn on their own and to arrive at their own conclusions rather than have information given to them. As a result, many of them did not participate fully and would not gain much insight from the session. In the game, however, students felt fully engaged.

> You had the opportunity the whole session to think for yourself, and it wasn't like a lecture where someone was sorta doing the thinking for you. . . . You don't have to be passive—it's active, that's the most important. I learned stuff from people on my staff instead of just getting handouts or being told facts.
>
> It's not lecturing. I mean everything else is lecturing or just hear different people. You're active in a game. I think that's why I like it. You're opening up your views, but you really don't know you're doing it at the time 'cause you're involved in the game and you really become the roles that you're playing.

Other advantages over alternative diversity training formats that students identified in playing Collidascope were fewer feelings of defensiveness and threat. Students felt they were able to discuss their feelings more openly without as much fear that other participants would attack them. The issue of safety is critical when doing diversity training. If the students do not feel safe sharing their experiences or thoughts, no real work will be accomplished. Students should feel free to share their thoughts without fear of intimidation or consequence, and the students appreciated the game for that aspect.

> In the past, I guess, you know, if I was being lectured at, I felt like I was being accused of lots of things because I was a White person. So this is much more laid back. You can learn from it, and you don't feel like you're going to get into trouble for saying the wrong thing or doing the wrong thing, and you're given the opportunity to see the other side.

> It's much more enjoyable than those experiences. It's something that you can sit through without getting defensive.

Students also felt that using this game made the session more flexible and that they felt they had some control over the direction of the discussion. In previous training sessions, they felt the facilitator controlled the content as well as how long they would spend on a given topic, which frustrated the students because they did not feel that their needs were being met. If the conversation created conflict, students felt that some facilitators would move on to avoid the topic even though the students wanted a chance to work it out further with one another.

> In [Collidascope] we had more say in what was said and we got to change the direction or decide what direction we wanted it to go based on what we wanted to talk about. In the other sessions it was like the facilitator decided what we were going to talk about, but in this game we got to decide. Especially when we could tell that there were some things being said that was starting to upset people then we could stop and address that issue.

Even though a facilitator is used when playing Collidascope, students felt as though they had more of a say in where and how long a discussion would take place. In reality, just as in other diversity training programs, facilitators can use their position to direct as little or as much as they like.

Students noted that the reason this game was so successful was that it allowed them the opportunity to speak personally on the issues and it was not threatening to them. They felt that having specific situations made it easier to discuss because the group was less likely to go off on unrelated tangents or get out of control. Their previous diversity sessions were too often so general in scope that they did not feel the topics were relevant to

their lives. For example, students typically had a more difficult time understanding institutionalized oppression that facilitators would discuss than interracial dating or roommate conflicts.

> I think it makes it easier because it specifies one area of the general topic, so we go from there because instead of just throwing out racism when we start talking—you know, that can get hairy, out of control.
>
> I think it was easier because, like I said, you're just given a situation. If someone just said, "How do you feel about racism?" It's just too broad of a question. These gave you specifics, and they started off easy, just with fact questions, to get you in that frame of mind.

Beyond how topics were discussed, students' developmental level in content knowledge and experience with issues of diversity may have influenced how successful the game was. Students seemed to be split 60-40 on whether this kind of game should be used for people who have some information or understanding of diversity and those who have little information. Some students felt that it would be a valuable learning experience if students share the knowledge and experience they have with one another. This peer teaching element appealed to many of the students. They were less resistant being challenged by peers than they were to being challenged by the facilitator. Other students, however, thought that conflict would arise between students who had given some thought to these issues and those who had never considered such ideas. One student said, "Students who are dualistic—the fact cards are just—are perfect for them. And they are then challenged when we get to the situation cards that require them to look relatively."

Student Reflections about Playing the Game

Awareness Changes

Many of the students stated that the reason they remembered some of the situations is because they had never thought about them before or they had not considered different perspectives. Though they had discussed racism and heterosexism in broad terms many times during training, they had not experienced more detailed or real-life situations. Having more real-life situations to discuss generated more energy than previous experiences. The following statements refer to the situation card about whether White parents should be able to adopt a child of color. For the students at the public college, this particular situation had them thinking from a different perspective. Most of them stated that at the beginning of this situation they were certain that it would be fine for White parents to adopt children of color. It was not until an African American woman spoke against such adoptions that the White students gave it a second thought.

> My own opinions that I thought were very strong were kind of shot.
>
> I didn't think about it from that point of view really.
>
> The game made us think of things in a different way than we would normally. . . . I knew there was a problem before, but the game made you do something about it, so that afterwards I wanted to do more things about other things that I just hadnt thought about.
>
> Student: I still remember having mixed feelings about the White couple adopting a Black person. I still didn't know whether or not I thought it was right or not.
> MC: Had you initially had a pretty clear idea about which one you thought before the game?
> Student: Yeah. Then I changed.
> MC: After the debate happened?
> Student: Yeah.

Some students questioned their fear of associating with gay, lesbian, or bisexual people. They came to realize a double standard they did not know existed for them. As a result, they initiated a process in which they could assess their own homophobia, whereas previously they were unaware it existed.

> I think the game taught me more about maybe my own heterosexism too. And I started questioning why I never went to the friends of gay-lesbian group before, and I started questioning, like, am I judging different causes based on my own value system and, if so, why? Why is it okay to be Black but then in my own mind I have a hesitation about if somebody's gay?
>
> The neat thing about this [game] is that we were talking and everything was fine and dandy, and then the next day the minute I came off the elevator and saw [a gay participant], the first thing I said to myself was, "Damn, he's gay." What I'm saying is that every time I see him, I label him gay and I treat or act differently around him than I did before.

A day before the game was played, a participant revealed his gay identity to a woman participating in the study. One of the role-play situations had participants responding to a person who was making derogatory gay jokes. In this student's words she was "caught" laughing at these jokes by the student who had just come out to her.

> Let's talk about sticky situations! Game had potential to be fun, but I was always too conscious of who was there. . . . I know I'll act differently from now on though. He caught me laughing at the "gay" joke. . . . From the added experience I gained from the game, I was a little better prepared. But the rest of the game really stirred things up in my mind. All my originally set opinions were either questioned or changed! . . . The fact cards, honestly I'll probably forget, but the questions that challenged my values I'll always remember.

Behavioral Changes

Students were still able to recall something significant from playing the game even after one month. Students from the public college seemed to have been influenced more than the students from the private university. The students from the public college readily recalled items from the game. They shared comments equally between the two subjects of racism and heterosexism. Almost half of the students reported some behavioral changes after playing the game. Such changes included an increase in awareness or changes in their use of language, joke telling, confrontation, and being more inclusive of those who are different from themselves.

Students commented on their behavioral changes in terms of language usage; some said they were more likely to confront offensive language or joke telling after playing the game and the experiences that followed. For some, the game experience helped to identify situations or words that are offensive to gay, lesbian, or bisexual people that they had not been aware of before. For others, previous to playing the game they may have been aware that these jokes or slurs were inappropriate, but they would not confront people using them.

> Our group was in the role play where we were supposed to be laughing at the gay jokes. I wouldn't laugh at, like, a joke about a homosexual or something like that. I caught myself still doing that, and that whipped me into shape quick, you know. I know I won't do it again. And since then, actually, I was sitting here with somebody last night, and they made some kind of demeaning joke, like that. It was actually my boyfriend. I ended up slapping him in the face, not real hard, but he got mad. Since then I caught myself stopping a lot of jokes like that.
>
> I guess I do pick up more on certain things, not everything. I mean, I still don't notice every little detail; but you know, I've heard other comments or just picked up on things that maybe I hadn't noticed before that people said or just noticed the sexist language, race, and everything, and that was something that I kind of related to the game.

> There were things brought up in the game that I didn't really pick up on before and never really thought about before.
>
> I think I'm probably even more likely now to confront somebody, or at least jokes and stuff like that, to not tolerate it.

One student told about an incident in which a parent wanted his daughter moved from the floor she was living on because this RA had posted information on the bulletin board which supported gay, lesbian, and bisexual people. The RA confronted the situation and refused to remove the information from the board. "I told [the father] that I was set in my decision. . . . As of today the sign is still there. I've never done that before, I always back down. But not today!"

Conflict among Students: Need for Agreement

In addition to playing the game, students had to participate in three individual interviews and one group interview. They were also asked to keep a journal of anything they experienced in the four weeks following the playing of the game that reminded them of the game or the topics discussed. Immediately following the playing of the game, a group interview was conducted with the students involved in the study. The goal of this interview was to ask the students how they experienced the game and what they had taken from the experience. During this interview some of the issues of conflict erupted, but discussion of this conflict did not happen until their individual interviews one week later. The students clearly wanted to avoid any conflict by not discussing the conflict openly, allowing them a false sense of consensus.

At the public college, the students' energy level resulted in interruptions and cross-talk and completing another student's thought as a

way of agreeing with what that person was saying. They appeared eager to share their thoughts with others and received support for doing so. They demonstrated their support for each other by huddling in a small double circle with much physical contact. When someone would share something of substance, people would often lean over to touch the person and make a brief comment of affirmation.

About two thirds of the way through the interview, however, the tone changed. The only person of color in the study at the public college began to express the frustration she was experiencing. She asserted that she did not want to be doing this interview because she was angry. She felt the game demonstrated her peers' inconsistency between where they thought they were with regard to racism and where they really were in their information and understanding. This contradiction angered her because she had believed and trusted in the level of understanding she thought they had achieved during previous training and team building. As a result, she felt deceived by her peers.

> In RA staff training everyone's talking like they're up here [gesturing], but this game brought out the true colors. So I think I was just misled. I just was thrown off guard for a minute because I expected something, because that's what they led me to believe.

As a result, the tone and energy of the group in the interview shifted dramatically. The group's focus was now on this African American woman: she was expected to explain herself and to defend her feelings. The White students reacted in three ways. Some of the White students attempted to make her feel better or to apologize. Other students were angry, believing she had ruined a good conversation and diminished the feelings of closeness within the group. Most of the students became silent, their body language

demonstrating their discomfort with the conflict. I told the African American woman that if she did not want to be involved in the interview any longer that it would be fine to leave. She declined the invitation but remained frustrated and quiet. The interview ended shortly after, with many of the participants milling around the room. Several of them sought out the African American woman.

Her reaction to the game was mentioned by more than half of the group at the public college as what they remembered about the game experience one week later. Although some of the students did not appreciate what they thought was this student's negative reaction to the game, it did prompt some of them to talk with her later, opening a dialogue they were glad they had. When asked what they remembered from the experience of playing the game, some of the students responded with the comments below.

> First thing, I thought [the game] was a positive experience but that got sorta knocked down because of what one of our staff members said afterwards. I mean I'm not saying that she should have just kept her mouth shut. But she might have been able to do it a little more tactfully, because, you know, I mean, it's obvious that everyone was waiting on her opinion, and who wouldn't, so, you know, I think if she said something a little more mild, it would have helped everyone else out, 'cause I certainly wouldn't want anyone to go away from that thinking negatively instead of positively.
>
> She was upset at another person in another group that said something that upset her, and then that led on to a really good discussion. About four other people just stopped, and we talked about an hour after the game . . . about racial issues. It was pretty good. I'm a lot closer to this person now than I was before.

In retrospect, many of the White students who felt uncomfortable with the African American woman's perceptions now saw this experience as a learning opportunity. They stated over and over again that they had never

considered her point of view before and many had changed their positions. Unfortunately, what the African American woman remembers most from the experience one week later is this:

> I'm not as willing to share my feelings or experiences with the staff because I don't think they're going to take it seriously. . . . I just felt like I was the spokesperson for the Black community, and I had good points and bad points, you know. I feel good when it's helping others to understand more about Black people, but then it can also be negative when people think that I represent the whole group.

Postgame interviews at the private university revealed a similar scenario to the one just mentioned at the public college. Students experienced feelings of anger, distraction, caution, or impatience with one of the other participants. Students at the private university were able to recall this student as one of the more memorable experiences of playing the game. They consistently stated that they did not appreciate the attitude or behavior this student brought to the game. During the game, they became increasingly frustrated by this student because of his rigid interpretation of the rules. When the other students wanted to take one of the scenarios further or expand on it, this student was adamant that it was not what they were "supposed" to do, and as a result the focus shifted away from the scenario to his unyielding behavior.

During the preinterview with this student, a White male, he wanted to be certain that I understood his position on diversity and the enormous amount of "indoctrination" that went on at his particular university, especially with the residence life department. He described himself as a conservative Republican who resisted any attempts to indoctrinate people regarding issues of diversity. He found the interviews themselves to be fun

and engaging, perhaps because he had an opportunity to share his perspective. Even so, he thought the game was boring and of little value. He did not believe the game itself to be an indoctrination tool but thought it could become one, depending on the facilitator.

When asked why he volunteered to be in the study, he responded that he thought it would be interesting and important. Of the 17 participants, all of whom were volunteers, he was the only person to describe himself as conservative. This leads me to wonder if it was a function of the game that only somewhat liberal, like-minded people wanted to play a diversity game, or was it a function of the job of an RA? Do more liberally minded students apply to be RAs, or are they the ones who are hired?

Individual interviews were conducted a week later and students were asked what they perceived to be the purpose of the game. Many responded that this game was a way to address difficult topics. They thought of the game as a tool to "prod people along to think about things they wouldn't normally think about" and that "it gets to both sides of an issue."

Contradictions: Interviews, Game, and Journals

The postgame interviews and journals did influence how much of the experience the students remembered. They stated that they paid special attention to certain events or tried harder to remember significant interactions because of the interviews following the game. This influence was most noticed during the one-month-later interviews. When asked what kind of impact the interviews and journal-keeping had on them, students consistently responded with comments such as:

> Maybe my answers are biased by the fact that I've been asked to continue thinking about it. . . . Perhaps I wouldn't have thought about

> it as much if I didn't know that every time I did think about it I was supposed to write it down. . . . If it had been the only experience that I had with [diversity], I think I probably would have remembered more of it.
>
> Because I knew this interview was coming up, I think that's maybe one reason that I have kept the game in my mind.

In addition to the interviews, students were asked to keep a journal of their experiences following the playing of the game. The information the students shared in their journals revealed some of the more explicit examples of how issues of race and sexual orientation played out in their everyday lives. I was somewhat surprised by some of their comments, particularly around issues of race, because they appeared to contradict the nonoppressive attitudes they espoused in interviews and during the game. The journals described some of the conflicts the students were experiencing. The contradictions came in three forms: (a) Students expressed contradictions between their words and their actions and were unaware of these contradictions; (b) some students were able to identify the contradictions between their prejudicial behavior and their inner belief in social justice and getting to the next step of confronting themselves or others to change behavior was the biggest challenge; and (c) students expressed contradictions and did not care.

A couple of students spoke of several instances in which they participated in slurs or derogatory jokes directed toward African Americans and gays, lesbians, and bisexuals.

> I don't know why I participated in this, but I guess sometimes you just don't think. Shouldn't really have to think not to remark on something like that. But when you've spent maybe 18 years of your life "practicing" racial ways of thinking and living, it's hard not to.

In my heart I disagreed with it, but on the outside I gave a laugh.

Some of the White students felt anger when discussing racism. Across the board, students' common perceptions of a double standard between Whites and Blacks was evident. One student spoke of how a roommate change would have been handled differently had the situation been reversed.

> [The supervisor] said the room change could be made but that it wouldn't have happened if it was the other way around, if [John] was Black living with three White guys. That really bothered me and also [her immediate supervisor].

> Sister Souljah came to [a nearby college] yesterday. She stated that there is no such thing as reverse discrimination. I think that's absolutely false. She and other leftist Blacks only seek special privileges. Affirmative action is discriminatory and also is a disincentive for minorities to better themselves.

Another theme some students mentioned in their journals was the dissonance that either the game or the interviews created.

> After [the individual interview] I felt pretty indifferent. Maybe slightly frustrated. Some of the topics we talked about are very complex, and it's tough to know what to think or feel about them.

Summary

This chapter addressed the research questions asked at the beginning of this research project:

1. How did participants experience playing the game?

2. How did playing the game influence the participants' knowledge, awareness, and actions regarding racism and heterosexism?

Most of the participants enjoyed the experience of playing the game and found it to be a useful way to enter into dialogue about diversity issues. The two factors most responsible for this positive experience were that participants perceived the game to be fun and interactive. This perception was in contrast to previous mandatory diversity training experiences they had reported, which students found to be stressful and generally nonparticipatory for them.

The responses were mixed about the game's influence on the participants' knowledge, awareness, and actions regarding racism and heterosexism. A majority of the participants believed the game increased their awareness and the likelihood that they would confront behaviors they perceived as racist or homophobic. Other participants stated that although the game may have increased their awareness level, it had only short-term effects and that they were unlikely to change any of their behaviors. Overall, the students concluded that they enjoyed the experience of playing the game much more than their previous diversity experiences, and they would recommend playing the game again.

In the next chapter I conclude with a discussion of results, some recommendations for the game based on the information discussed, and future research considerations.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Chapter 4 reported the research results. Chapter 5 will be divided into five sections: (a) an introduction; (b) a discussion of results, in which I explore contextual factors that affected the game—such as group size and relationships, safety issues, political correctness, social identities, and overestimates of knowledge and awareness—and game characteristics affecting the playing experience; (c) a critique of the game itself; (d) an exploration of the possible implications for the game; and (e) other diversity tools and future research considerations.

In order to draw some conclusions from the research, it is important to remember the original research questions.

1. How did participants experience playing the game?

2. How did playing the game influence the participants' knowledge, awareness, and actions regarding racism and heterosexism?

As reviewed in chapter 4, participants enjoyed the experience of playing the game. They found it to be an interactive and engaging way to discuss issues of diversity. They appreciated the opportunity to express how they felt and what they thought about these issues. Previous training experiences regarding issues of diversity often left them feeling defensive and anxious. More often than not, the facilitators of these previous sessions did

most of the talking, leaving the participants to do most of the listening. As a result, participants were not as engaged in their previous experiences as they were in playing this game.

Participants' knowledge level increased from low to moderate. The increases appeared to have resulted from the situation cards; participants were unable to recall most of the fact cards. Their awareness levels in racism and heterosexism increased to a higher degree than their knowledge levels. They were able to relate many of the situation cards to their own life experiences, thus making the learning more personally meaningful. They were more likely to change their behavior as it related to racism than to heterosexism.

There were some differences in experience between the two groups. One group had more energy and a higher level of involvement. Possible explanations for the variation in experience included the size of the group, level of familiarity among group members, and facilitator.

Discussion of Results

When preparing participants for the game, the facilitators needed to address several concerns with the group. These concerns were not discussed within the context of this study but developed while playing the game with both groups of participants. Three broad concerns were common to both groups: (a) the importance of group building or trust building before the actual playing of the game, (b) the desire of the majority of participants to avoid conflict while playing the game, and (c) the tendency of participants to portray themselves as more knowledgeable and tolerant on issues of race and sexual orientation than their knowledge or behavior indicated.

These three concerns should have been addressed before the actual playing of the game, which could have been done by the facilitator sharing these concerns with the participants. The first issue of group and trust building would best be accomplished by engaging participants in getting to know one another before playing the game. The more time participants are able to spend with one another, the more likely they are to trust one another. If little time is available, the sharing of names and hopes or fears about playing the game would be a useful, quick, efficient activity.

The remaining two concerns, which involved the avoidance of conflict and self-perceptions of knowledge and acceptance, would best be addressed by the facilitator in his or her introduction to the game. A brief discussion could be initiated by the facilitator by asking participants why they may have a tendency to avoid any disagreement or conflict while playing the game and why as participants they may exaggerate their level of knowledge and awareness. When this discussion was completed, the facilitator could encourage participants to take risks and not to shy away from conflicts that will inevitably occur since they also can be a valuable part of the learning process.

Contextual Factors Affecting Game

Overall, students enjoyed the experience of playing the game and found it to be a useful and productive way to address diversity education. Nonetheless, some factors that influenced how successful the experience was should be considered when planning similar educational experiences for other college students.

Relationship with Other Players. Students were asked what impact their relationship with the other participants had on their experience of playing the game. The participants' relationships were one of the major differences between the two schools. The public college students were well acquainted with each other. They had been on the same staff for a minimum of one semester and had been through quite a bit of team building and other types of bonding experiences. Students consistently commented that they felt connected to one another and felt some degree of trust and safety. As a result, they felt more comfortable sharing their thoughts with one another and were more concerned with how the other students responded to their comments. Students from the public college achieved a higher level in discussing the issues, and a major factor was their relationship before playing the game. When asked how the experience might have differed if they did not know the people with whom they were playing, they responded:

> I think it would have changed it a lot because you wouldn't have felt comfortable in opening up.
>
> If it was a group of strangers or people I didn't know as well, then you probably would be a lot more hesitant.

Conversely, students from the private university were virtual strangers. They came from different staffs, and two thirds of them were newly hired RAs. These students seemed more tentative with one another. They did not have the same kind of familiarity such as joking or conversing that the other group experienced. This was one of the most significant differences between the groups which I believe strongly influenced the game's effectiveness. Because no trust had developed among the students at the private university, they were less apt to share and take risks. One student's

comment was, "I do think that it made us more cautious when playing in terms of responding to other people."

A few students, however, preferred not knowing or being acquainted with the other participants. Playing with strangers allowed them to be more honest because they didn't have an investment in what the other students thought.

> I really didn't know the other people there, and so it was like, I could say what I thought, and which was really, that was beneficial because I could say what I thought and without ever hampering myself, thinking, "I'm going to offend someone else."

Size of Playing Group. Beyond the relationship among the players, the size of the group also determined the interaction level among the participants. The private university had only six players, which limited the diversity of thought and put pressure on the students to speak more frequently. With such small numbers, students risked saying something that no one else might agree with, so they found it easier to say nothing. In the larger group of 25 participants at the public college, the students engaged in higher-risk dialogue because the odds were far greater that someone in the group might agree with their statement. A minimum group size of 10 or 12 and a maximum size of 25 to 30 players would work best.

Safety. Some of the items in the literature review for this study suggest that when conducting prejudice reduction education, the facilitator must at some point create dissonance within the participants. This dissonance or inner conflict puts into motion a process whereby the participants must explore their old belief systems when faced with new information. This conflict is intentionally created by the facilitator in order to nudge the

participants out of their comfort zone, which in turn forces them to confront some of their own inconsistencies and biases.

While creating such dissonance, the facilitator must also attend to the issue of safety. If the participants do not feel safe, they will most likely keep their comments to themselves. It was obvious with these two groups of students that one aspect of feeling safe was the level of conflict during the diversity trainings. Students consistently commented on how some of their past diversity trainings were full of conflict, and they resisted such trainings.

Concerns regarding safety as well as creating dissonance are not so much contradictions as they are essential tools when creating a learning environment where students feel both supported and challenged. Although students are often quick to label a training session as either supportive or confrontational, those involved in creating these environments must produce training sessions that are both supportive and challenging. Students get bored if the session does not challenge them and get angry and defensive if it is too challenging. The trick becomes finding the right balance between the two. In order to find this balance, however, the facilitator must seek that balance from the students. The students, not the facilitator, should be the prime indicators of how much the leader can push before he or she has pushed too far.

A fear of being ostracized by their peers, of "sticking out" in the crowd, was a powerful influence and a concern about safety. Students from the public college felt safer with one another because they had a relationship and had bonded with one another at some level. This bond freed them up to talk more honestly because they felt as if people knew them and if they said something stupid that they would be given the benefit of the doubt. Students at the private university had no relationship with one another, and I believe

this to be the most influential factor in that group having a less meaningful experience than the public college group. Although the game still had a level of effectiveness at the university, I would recommend that the game works best with groups who have already established some interaction or relationship with each other.

Students also commented that they felt safer when they broke into their smaller groups during the game. By having the opportunity to discuss their opinions at more length, they did not feel as much pressure to get out the "right" response the first time out. Therefore, smaller group size may provide participants with a bit more safety.

Target and Dominant Participation. What did work well with both groups was having both target and dominant members playing at the same time, which was most obvious during racism discussions when White students would make a statement without having any clue about the perspectives of students of color. This mixture allowed the students to deal with each other on a more genuine level, not contrived, as many reported about their previous training experiences. Students did not have to imagine scenarios or guess what it might be like because both dominants and targets were present. The students of color helped raise the consciousness of their White peers when discussing racism. In contrast, when discussing heterosexism, no students identified as members of the target group (gay, lesbian, or bisexual), thus leaving the dominants to do their own work. Although they did a fair job of discussing some of the major issues the situation cards raised, it was done with less passion. It was easier for them to dismiss heterosexism as an issue because it seemed less prevalent and therefore less important than racism. They were not as likely to make as

many personal connections with this issue and perhaps did not take as much from the experience.

Differences between Men and Women. Some of the more significant differences occurred between the sexes. Some of these differences were stylistic while others were more content based. With regard to learning style differences, men were more likely to say that the debates had more impact on them, and the women felt the visualizations were most significant. This difference is not surprising, given the socialization differences between the sexes. Men engaged more in fact-based lecture or debate format as a means of communication than women. During the visualizations, however, participants were asked to switch roles, placing them in a situation in which they were unlikely ever to find themselves. Women identified more with having to feel what it might be like to be someone else.

Expression of emotions by the men centered mostly around anger or defensiveness. Many of them expressed frustration at being a White male and the stereotyping that accompanies that status. Many felt they were not given the benefit of the doubt when it came to issues of diversity and that most people thought them to be bigots because of their social identity.

The female students appeared more cautious in some of their remarks. They were more empathetic in their responses. Anger did appear when some of the White women spoke of racism and how they are misperceived for their race. Though this sentiment is similar to the experience of the White males, the White women questioned this occurrence in an effort to look for possible solutions to bridge the gap.

Some of the anger expressed by the White students centered around assumptions they felt were unfairly made about them and their race. Such

perceptions were not limited to race but also to expectations students felt around issues of diversity and their roles as RAs.

Influence of Political Correctness. Anyone conducting any diversity-related education cannot discount the impact political correctness has bestowed. Feeling pressure to be politically correct created a lot of emotion for students, especially for resident assistants. Students repeatedly remarked on the expectation they felt from their residence life department to say the right things and behave in a certain manner. They perceived that an emphasis on valuing diversity was the only acceptable way to act and if they did not celebrate this diversity that they might lose their jobs. Though some of these perceptions may have been exaggerated, these RAs do indeed feel pressure to conform to a standard that at the very least tries to promote diversity education. This pressure, real or perceived, creates an enormous barrier to overcome when conducting diversity training.

If RAs feel that their jobs are in jeopardy, or that there may be consequences for not conforming to this standard, two things may result. One possible outcome is that the student will shut down and not say anything, therefore eliminating the risk of getting in trouble. Several students during the study made similar comments about the safety of silence. The second possible outcome is that the student will give the "company line," or what he or she thinks the facilitators or the boss wants to hear. This strategy is much more difficult to decipher. Either way, the dilemma is clear. How do people interested in furthering the value of diversity do so without creating some standards or guidelines to hold people accountable? But if these standards or guidelines prevent people from speaking freely and honestly, how can the goal of valuing diversity be achieved?

The Need to Be Nice or Avoid Conflict. Although students spoke of the pressures of conforming to the guidelines of political correctness, they neglected to acknowledge the benefit derived from such conformity. What became evident during the playing of the game and during the interviews was the need for the students to be nice and comfortable with one another. They equated this "niceness" and "comfort" with being sensitive and accepting of diversity. By using politically correct terms or attitudes, students had a built-in safety zone they could all agree on. For example, students would not have used the terms nigger and colored people because they knew they were not politically correct and chaos would result. As long as they used the politically correct term people of color, everyone could remain "nice" and "comfortable."

This philosophy of "nice and comfortable," which most of the students adhered to, creates a barrier when conducting diversity education. It impedes students from sharing their real but not-so-nice or not-so-comfortable feelings and attitudes. These students feard that if they shared these feelings they would be perceived as racist, a label that is not politically correct. In my opinion, many of these students altered their behavior or language out of this fear. They did not, however, have the same level of fear for being labeled homophobic. Some believed that this label is still acceptable and has fewer consequences. As a result, in many diversity trainings students end up trading politically correct role plays, slogans, and speeches at the expense of real learning. It is not until someone in the group takes a risk to break the barrier of political correctness that other students feel safe in sharing their real feelings.

Knowledge and Comfort Level Contradictions. Another consistent theme among students from both groups is that they assessed themselves at a much higher level in their knowledge and comfort in both categories of racism and heterosexism than some of their statements and behaviors indicated. On only one occasion, and due to some of my clarifying statements, did one of the students being interviewed come to terms with this contradiction. Even when faced with the contradiction that perhaps he is not as comfortable with gay people as he thinks, he appeared unbothered. Once again, the students may be telling us what they think we want to hear. And because they are RAs and RAs are "supposed" to be diversity sensitive, they end up rating themselves higher than they really are.

Fear of Being Labeled Racist. These overestimates can probably best be explained by understanding the developmental level of the students involved. If developmental theory was used in an informal manner, most of the students in this study would fall into one of the second or third stage of Jackson and Hardiman's oppression/liberation model. Students in second stage of acceptance are accepting of attitudes and stereotypes. When interviewed, many students either said directly or implied that they were not prejudiced, an indication of the acceptance stage. If students acknowledged they were prejudiced, they would be equated with not being nice or being bigoted, both labels they worked hard to avoid. A vicious circle begins to take shape, and it looks like this: Students are afraid of being labeled as prejudiced, so they avoid saying anything that might be construed as politically incorrect or prejudiced. Because they remain silent and do not take risks, their real thoughts and feelings are never made public. Without disclosure of their real thoughts and feelings, a dialogue that challenges any of the assumptions or

stereotypes the students have cannot begin. Therefore, nothing meaningful is learned.

If students in this study overestimated their levels of knowledge and comfort regarding racism and heterosexism, then they underestimated the impact their previous diversity training sessions provided. Students thought they knew more and were more comfortable about racism and heterosexism than they actually were. They also stated that they did not learn much from previous diversity trainings, when in actuality they gave many examples of how much they learned.

When asked to assess themselves as first-year students regarding racism and heterosexism, students typically rated themselves very low, as a 1 or a 2 on a scale of 5. (They rated themselves at 4 to 5 for their present status.) When asked what could explain their leap from a 1 or a 2 to a present assessment of a 4 or a 5, they cited two reasons: One was the training they had received as RAs, other diversity programs, or classroom learning. The second factor was their interaction with people who were different from them racially or who were gay, lesbian, or bisexual. Most students suggested that each of the two factors influenced them almost equally. What is even more interesting, however, is that when asked if they had friends who were different from them racially or in sexual orientation, many of the students said they did not have such friends. They were able to give few examples of interactions with people different from them racially or in sexual orientation. And when they did provide such examples, many of these occurred during diversity training sessions.

In my opinion, therefore, the students were underestimating the effectiveness of these trainings, perhaps because of the amount of conflict that erupted during their previous experiences. Conflicts during these sessions

were often seen as nonproductive. A few of the students did acknowledge that although some of these diversity training sessions had been hostile and conflicting, they still learned from the experience. As a result, some of these students ended up resisting diversity trainings more. Many did eventually conclude that they learned something positive.

Responsibility for Education. Locus of control is a way of describing how people perceive their own degree of control in the world. People with an external locus of control believe that circumstances outside of themselves determine the course of events. People with internal locus of control believe that their own thoughts and beliefs control circumstances and events. Almost all of the students demonstrated an external locus of control when discussing issues of diversity; they would usually place the blame or accountability for any injustice on someone or something beyond themselves. It was a rare exception for students to look at their own behavior or attitude as an explanation for any kind of injustice.

This view of control is a pivotal point when dealing with social justice education for two reasons. First, it influences the students' levels of motivation. If students feel that someone else or something else is to blame for injustice and they have no control over events, they will believe that self-education is fruitless. The common statements and overall attitudes displayed by the students in this study supported this view. Their comments such as "You're singing to the choir" suggest we are working with the wrong group of people and that in order to make change we should work instead with the ones who "don't get it." "We've done this before" could translate into "We've done this before, so we shouldn't have to do it again." Students

believe they know all there is to know about these topics and this resistance makes it very difficult for them to learn.

The second way this external locus of control influences the students is their ability to believe that they personally can create change and that they can influence events around them. Many students comment on their own inability to make a difference. They make little or no attempt to challenge injustice because of their own perceived insignificance. If students could see the differences that everyday common people have on influencing change, they might begin to shift that locus of control inward. Once this shift occurs, students will want more personal knowledge and strategies of how to initiate change.

Game Characteristics Affecting Game Experience

I believe two factors affected the students' experience of playing Collidascope: (a) the fact that it was a game, and therefore fun was implied, and (b) the role of the facilitator, who set the tone of the game before playing it. A facilitator who allows the students safety in speaking their mind will see students in his or her group animated and engaged in the playing of the game.

Fun Factor. One strategy for lessening the effects of political correctness is to create a diversion or distraction for the students and how they typically experience diversity training. The mind-set and the energy students bring to the training session strongly influence their experience. Many of the students said they were excited to come to this particular training session because they were going to play a game and perceived it to be fun. Initially their focus was on playing the game, not on the purpose of the game, diversity training. They brought a high level of energy and enthusiasm to the session, in stark

contrast to how they entered many of their previous diversity training sessions. Typically they said their attitude in those sessions was one of dread, stress, and a "here we go again" mentality. Their energy level was low, and their attitude was poor. They assured the "diversity training position" of sitting with their arms crossed, waiting to be lectured to. They took little responsibility for the direction or success of the program, leaving that responsibility to the facilitator.

Although the subject of diversity is a serious topic, humor and fun can be used as vehicles when educating. Games, humor, and interactive formats frequently distract participants from the stress often associated with diversity education. When participants can laugh as well as cry with one another, the full range of human emotions will make that experience much more memorable and real.

Most people enjoy sharing stories of their own experience. Social justice education (SJE) is one area in which these stories serve as lessons. When participants share their stories, they often end up challenging as well as supporting one another. When planning diversity workshops, the facilitator must recognize the need for such sharing. If participants are not allowed to share their thoughts and feelings, they will leave frustrated. If such sharing is not possible during the workshop itself, time should be allotted to allow this process after the session.

When the Collidascope game was used as an approach to diversity training, students focused on this change in such a way that they temporarily forgot how much they tyupically resisted such trainings. And because many students associated playing the game with having fun, most participants automatically made the connection that this session was enjoyable. This

attitude adjustment is perhaps the biggest obstacle to overcome when conducting diversity training.

Facilitator Role. When conducting diversity training programs, the facilitator must acknowledge the risks for students in speaking up and speaking honestly during the session. The facilitator must establish a climate that gives the students permission to say what is not politically correct if that is what they believe. The game of Collidascope is not immune to the influence of political correctness. During the game, some of the students made attempts to remain quiet to avoid the consequences of political incorrectness. Considerable hope comes, though, from the students who tried to remain quiet and disengaged during the game but said they were unsuccessful in their attempts and found themselves having to speak up. I believe the reason they had difficulty in remaining quiet is because they saw their peers speaking up, as opposed to the facilitator doing so much of the talking. It is less intimidating for students to challenge one another than it is trying to challenge the facilitator as the perceived "expert." Therefore, if students are given an atmosphere where they do not feel judged or do not perceive possible negative consequences for their feelings, they will in all likelihood speak more freely. Such discussions can be enhanced even further if students are allowed to participate at a high rate with the facilitator taking a less public or powerful role instead of being a lecturer.

Critique of Collidascope

Diversity education can be conducted in many ways that are both interactive and fun. Using a game is only one way. Collidascope achieved its goal of engaging participants while offering an avenue into discussing topics

that are, for many, difficult to discuss. By varying learning styles, Collidascope was accessible to all learners. This variation in learning styles and content of topics offered enough change that the participants were likely to stay engaged and want to play again. This motivation to play again is a key to Collidascope's success because it motivates the individual to learn. This attitude of self-education is crucial to diversity education.

Beyond the variation in learning styles, Collidascope allowed the participants more control over the direction of the discussion as well as an active role in that discussion. They received information in a more active way rather than passively accepting information. Despite prevailing perceptions, students really do want to discuss issues of diversity; what they don't want is to be lectured at.

Modifications to Game

One modification the students requested was to have more information on the fact cards. Some of the fact cards gave explanations about the question, providing participants with either a historical or cultural examination. Due to the size of the cards, however, room was not available to say more. This frustrated some of the students whose curiosity level was heightened by the question.

Expected Results

The experience with the group at the public college was much more of what I had expected than the experience with the private university. I had expected students to have fun, be engaged and enthusiastic, and to talk among themselves about some issues that are usually too risky or awkward to discuss. They accomplished all this. I did not believe that playing Collidascope

would be a life-changing event for them. It was not my intent that they would be able to recall all the information one month after the playing of the game. My greatest expectation was that this game would provide a vehicle for the students to talk about diversity topics without feeling judged, defensive, or deceiving. For the students at the public college the experience was what I had expected.

Surprises

I had not expected such a gap in the level of enjoyment and engagement between the two groups. At times I found myself bored by how little the students were engaged at the private university. I assumed that although the group was smaller in size the discussions would be more engaging than the group of 30. I was wrong. The students were less engaged in conversation and appeared to have little interest in maintaining such a discussion. Their apathy was probably directly related to the lack of any real relationship or commitment among the players.

Concerns

Collidascope was designed to make diversity education more accessible and enjoyable to students. The basic premise was to create an environment for students to discuss issues of diversity without feeling defensive, blamed, or bored. For the most part, Collidascope achieved my original goals. What is not clear is whether the game has an inherent bias built into its creation. The students who volunteered to participate in this study, with the exception of one, all identified themselves as liberal and socially conscious. The exception identified himself as a "conservative Republican." My concern is that, once again, diversity education is "preaching to the converted," or in other words,

getting a group of somewhat like-minded individuals together for an exercise. Why did only one person who identified as conservative want to participate in this study? Is there an inherent bias in the selection of RAs, where most of the students identify themselves as liberal and as a result the possible pool of students was affected?

In most cases when this game is being used, the group is not a self-selected one, but rather a group whose attendance is mandatory. Unless the group playing has been selected with regard to their attitude on diversity issues, some of this concern is minimized. The student who did identify as conservative Republican did not feel the game itself was a tool to indoctrinate people, but he suggested that, depending on how it was used and facilitated, it could become one. His implication was clear: If the line between education and what he called "indoctrination" was crossed, then the game's effectiveness would be minimized. What his statement also suggested to me is that as long as the facilitator remains a facilitator, this game is useful because the students are the ones prompting the conversation. When the facilitator monopolizes the game and uses it as a bully pulpit, students lose interest and the desire to learn.

Recommendations for Most Effective Use of Game

There are five considerations when utilizing Collidascope as a social justice education tool: (a) previous experience or diversity of membership, (b) size of group, (c) relationship of players, (d) time, and (e) the role of the facilitator. In preparing to play Collidascope, these factors should be pondered to ensure effectivenss.

Players' Previous Experience/Diversity of Membership

One of the limitations of the game was the participants themselves. Part of the success of the game depends on the experiences and diversity of the participants. If participants are homogeneous or have limited experiences, they may be hindered in how much they take from the experience. The game is only as good as what the participants put into the experience.

Whether the game is used for those new to diversity education or those who have a higher level of experience, in this instance it seemed to be dictated by the players' experience as opposed to the cards themselves; the same card used by groups with varying experience could lead them to very different conversations. For example, the situation card to discuss interracial adoption began with a very simple and somewhat naive discussion. As more people participated, especially the students of color, the dialogue became more complex. Without the varied experiences and levels of information of the players, the conversation probably would have remained at a very introductory level because many of the White students had not given the issue as much thought as their African American peers. The more diverse the participants, the better the opportunity for a meaningful exchange.

Size of Group

Another factor to consider is the number of participants. As mentioned previously, the number of players had a significant impact on the success of the game. A too-large group did not allow the players time to participate at a high level. Too small a group, as displayed with the group at the private university, however, eliminates some of the safety and anonymity felt with a larger group. Minimums and maximums regarding numbers of players should be adhered to for a more meaningful experience.

Relationships of Players

I had made the assumption that this game would be successful regardless of the relationship among the players. The experience of playing the game was much more meaningful for participants at the public college, where they had formed a previous relationship with one another. The private university participants were virtual strangers, and the experience was less meaningful. Though I cannot be certain whether the success of the experience was influenced more by the number of participants or the relationships they had with one another, both had an impact. As far as their relationships to the other players were concerned, when asked, the students said that their behavior would probably have been different if their relationships with the other students had been different. Thus I would recommend that participants go through some group-building experience or that the game be used with players who already have previous relationships with one another.

Time

Time was a limitation discussed by participants. Not having enough time to get into as much depth in discussing the situations as the players would like was frustrating. The time factor, however, is not unique to this game. Time is often listed as one of the limitations to any diversity training program. Perhaps too much is attempted in a short span of time. This time factor was one reason the study chose to limit the focus of the issues to racism and heterosexism, in order to allow some depth to be achieved in the group's discussions. Regardless of these efforts, time was still a factor that frustrated the participants. A minimum of two hours should be allowed when playing the game.

Role of Facilitator

Facilitators should feel free to expand the realm of the questions in order to make the questions more pertinent to their campus or situation. It is not necessary or desirable to limit the discussion only to the scope of the question, therefore limiting the possible learning or connection made by the players.

The facilitator should be as "hands off" as possible, yielding as much control as possible to the participants. If the facilitator begins to lecture or take too much control over the direction of the discussion, the game's usefulness is at risk. Participants liked this game because they got to play it actively. The facilitator's job is to do exactly that, facilitate the process of playing the game.

It is also helpful if the facilitator has some rapport with the group. As demonstrated in this study, the facilitator at the public college had a much easier and successful time of facilitating the game than his peer at the private university. The biggest reason for this difference was the level of rapport each had with their group. The facilitator at the public college was working with the staff he hired four months previously. The facilitator at the private university was meeting most of his participants for the first time.

Future Research

Several variations of the game would be interesting to explore. Most are related to the selection of participants. In this study, RAs were used because they were the original target audience when Collidascope was created. During the study, questions arose regarding how the effectiveness of the game would be influenced with different participants.

How might the game change if participants were all targets or all dominants? Very likely it would not be as challenging for either of those

groups, and far less dissonance would be created. Without this dissonance, students would not take as much away from the experience because their old blief systems probably would not have been challenged. If participants with similar experiences play the game, they are less likely to disagree or challenge others' positions. If participants do disagree, however, the task of confronting becomes even greater because of the assumptions of this shared experience by the other players.

Conversely, it is possible for the discussions to reach a far greater depth because participants may feel much safer to share their beliefs without fear of offending someone else. There may be a closer bond among the players which would encourage and support taking risks and sharing meaningful information. This is supported by the creation of White-on-White racism workshops or male-only workshops, where the dominant group members gather to challenge each other on racism or sexism respectively.

Another consideration when selecting a different population to research would include a more balanced group when considering ideology. People who resist SJE as well as those who seek out such education should be included. Those who identify as Republican or Democrat, conservative or liberal, should be intentionally included. This balance might provide iformation about whether there is an inherent bias in the game.

Another group to consider for future research is a mix of students who are not affiliated with any organized group such as RAs. Because of the expectations placed on RAs regarding diversity issues, it would be interesting to see if students who do not have these expectations or responsibilities would react differently to the game.

One other possibility to explore is the types and closeness of relationships among the participants. During this study I found that the

experience was much more successful with the group who had formed relationships before playing the game. What impact would participants' relationships have on the game with a group who has a strong relationship and with a group with no prior relationship?

Aside from varying participants, it would also be interesting to vary the approach by having several control groups covering the same material but in different formats. For instance, if the topic is racism, one group would explore racism using a game format. A second group would explore racism in a lecture-style format using a facilitator. A third group would have a panel or roundtable discussion about racism. Would there be any significant long-term learning differences among the groups?

Closing Remarks

It is unusual for any one educational event to be life changing. More realistically, many educational events, formal and informal, accumulate into real learning and behavior change. Too often, diversity educators may inadvertently put pressure on themselves and the workshop participants to produce a life-changing event. This pressure, when felt by participants, often results in anything but a meaningful experience. Collidascope was not a life-changing event for most participants in this study, but certainly it was an effective tool for students to increase their understanding and awareness of these issues.

In her book, Killers of the Dream, Lillian Smith states, "Their are so many people determined not to do wrong but who are equally determined not do to right." Social justice education is a process to help people identify that not doing wrong is not enough at times. Sometimes not doing wrong translates into not doing anything. Social justice and diversity education call

for action, inward and outward, and we must come to understand that doing right means being just and respectful. Collidascope is one educational intervention that can move participants closer to this goal.

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

My name is Maura Cullen; I am a graduate student at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Currently I am initiating a research project for my doctoral dissertation. The project will solicit information from participants regarding an educational game, Collidascope, and its usefulness when doing diversity education.

Because the game is often used as a training tool for resident assistants (RAs), I have decided to target this group for my study. As an RA, you are being invited to participate in this study. Although many of the RAs on staff will be participating in the playing of the game, only 6–8 will be actual participants in my study from this site. The study consists of the following commitments:

1. Complete the Social Membership Profile Questionnaire. This form will aid in the selection of the participants who will go through the interview process.
2. Individual pregame interview (one hour).
3. Play the game Collidascope for a two-hour period with staff. Group interview to follow immediately after.
4. Individual interview one week after playing of game (one hour).
5. Individual interview one month after playing of game (one hour).
6. Keep a brief journal for one month after playing game, including incidents that might relate to the game and what they have taught you.

If you are interested in being a participant, please complete and detach the form below and return it to your resident director. I will contact you with more information. Thank you for your time.

****

Name _____

Address _____

_____

Phone _____

Best times and days to reach you: _____

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX B

SOCIAL MEMBERSHIP PROFILE QUESTIONNAIRE

One consideration when doing social justice education (SJE) is how effective a strategy is toward people from different social membership groups. It is also important to understand how dominants (people from groups with power) and targets (people from oppressed groups) experience this game.

The information you provide will be confidential. An identification number will be used in lieu of your name at all times to provide such confidentiality. I will be the only person who will have access to names and identification numbers. This matching is necessary when analyzing data. Please complete the following information.

Identification Number _____

Current address _____

_____

Telephone _____

Please describe the group to which you feel you belong:

GENDER
(Female, male) _____

RACE/ETHNICITY
(African American, European American, Latina/o,
Asian American, etc.; please specify) _____

SEXUAL ORIENTATION
(Gay, lesbian, bisexual, heterosexual, asexual) _____

RELIGION
(Gentile, Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim,
atheist, Jew, other) _____

ABILITY
(Currently able-bodied, physically disabled,
developmentally or learning disabled) _____

AGE _____

CLASS
(Poor, working class, middle class,
upper-middle class, upper class) _____

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM

My name is Maura Cullen; I am a graduate student at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Currently I am initiating a research project for my doctoral dissertation. The project will solicit information from participants regarding an educational game, Collidascope, and its usefulness when doing diversity education.

Because the game is often used as a training tool for resident assistants (RAs), I have decided to target this group for my study. As an RA, you are being invited to participate in this study. Although many of the RAs on staff will be participating in the playing of the game, only 6–8 will be actual participants in my study from this site. The study consists of the following commitments:

1. Complete the Social Membership Profile Questionnaire. This form will aid in the selection of the participants who will go through the interview process.
2. Individual pregame interview (one hour).
3. Play the game Collidascope for a two-hour period with staff. Group interview to follow immediately after.
4. Individual interview one week after playing of game (one hour).
5. Individual interview one month after playing of game (one hour).
6. Keep a brief journal for one month after playing game, including incidents that might relate to the game and what they have taught you.

All interviews will be at a location convenient for you; I will do all the travel. You will be assigned an identification number that will replace your name on all documents. Only I will have the information that can match that information. This anonymity means there will be no risk to you. You also have the right to withdraw from the study at any point up until one week after the final interview takes place. You are also free to review any of the material we discuss at any time. There are no consequences if you choose not to participate in this study. The results of this study will be made available at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst library upon completion of this dissertation.

I do want to extend my gratitude to you for taking time out of your busy life to give so much for this study. Please feel free to ask any questions or raise any concerns you may have over the study.

I have read the information contained on this sheet and agree to participate in this study and the terms outlined.

Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANT PREGAME INTERVIEW GUIDE

Identification Number _____

Date _____

Location _____

The purpose of this interview is to gain a better understanding of who you are. I have allotted an hour in order to give you plenty of time to respond without feeling rushed. If you do not understand a question or need clarification, I encourage you to let me know. With your permission, I will also be tape recording this session so that I may focus my attention on you instead of my notes. Your comments, however, will be kept confidential. Before we begin, do you have any questions?

1. When you hear the word <u>diversity</u> what do you think?

    a. What do you feel?

2. Have you gone through any diversity training regarding racism and/or heterosexism?

    a. If yes, please describe content, length, setting, purpose.

    b. If yes, what was that like?

3. What did you feel before the training, during, and after the training?

4. Have any of your behaviors changed as a result of these trainings?

    a. If so, please give an example.

    b. If no, why?

5. Have any of your attitudes changed as a result of these trainings?

    a. If so, please give an example.

    b. If no, why?

Below are two scales, one to measure how much <u>information</u> you believe you have relating to a particular issue, and the other scale to measure how you <u>feel</u> about a certain issue. The scales are rated from 1 to 5.

6. Please place yourself on the information scale regarding the following issues:

Heterosexism 1 2 3 4 5

Racism 1 2 3 4 5

1 = no information/knowledge
2 = little information/knowledge
3 = some information/knowledge
4 = fair amount of information/knowledge
5 = advanced amount of information/knowledge

Follow-up questions referring to to where he/she placed him-herself on the information scale:

7. In what form have you received information on racism and heterosexism? (i.e., courses, readings, movies, cultural events, personal experience, etc.)

8. How do you think your information level influences your attitudes and behaviors regarding racism? Heterosexism?

9. Please place yourself on the feeling scale regarding the following issues:

Heterosexism 1 2 3 4 5

Racism 1 2 3 4 5

1 = I feel extremely uncomfortable with (people of color/gay, lesbian, bisexual people.)
2 = I feel uncomfortable with _____ people.
3 = I feel somewhat comfortable with _____ people.
4 = I feel comfortable with _____ people.
5 = I feel very comfortable with _____ people.

Follow-up questions referring to the feeling scale:

10. What factors influence whether or not you feel comfortable with people of color? gays, lesbians, bisexuals?

11. Do you have friends who are people of color? gay, lesbian, bisexual?

12. How do you think having or not having people from those target groups affects your perceptions and feelings?

APPENDIX E

FACILITATOR PREGAME GUIDE

Identification _____

Date _____

Location _____

The purpose of this interview is to gain a better understanding of who you are. I have allotted an hour in order to give you plenty of time to respond without feeling rushed. If you do not understand a question or need clarification, I encourage you to let me know. With your permission, I will also be tape recording this session so that I may focus my attention on you instead of my notes. Your comments, however, will be kept confidential. Before we begin do you have any questions?

1. When you hear the word <u>diversity</u> what do you think?

    a. What do you feel?

2. Have you gone through any diversity training as a participant?

    a. If yes, please describe content, length, setting, purpose.

    b. If yes, what was that like?

3. Have you facilitated any diversity trainings?

    a. If yes, please describe content, length, setting, purpose.

    b. What was your assessment of the experience?

4. What kind of training tools have you utilized during your trainings?

5. Do you believe people's behaviors change as a result of these trainings?

    a. Have any of your behaviors changed?

    b. If so, please give an example.

    c. If you know of participants' behaviors changing, please provide an example.

6. Do you believe people's attitudes change as a result of these trainings?

a. Have any of your attitudes changed?

b. If so, please give an example.

c. If you know of participants' attitudes changing, please provide an example.

7. If you could change anything about diversity education or how it is presented, what would it be?

8. Have you had more success with some interventions than with others?

9. What are you thinking about facilitating the game?

10. What are you feeling about facilitating the game?

11. How is this similar to or different from past trainings?

12. Do you believe a game can be an effective teaching and learning tool regarding issues of diversity? Why or why not?

APPENDIX F

PARTICIPANT GROUP INTERVIEW GUIDE

The reason we are conducting a group interview as opposed to individual interviews is that, because the game is played as a group, the learning is set up as a group. The final two interviews will be done one-on-one. As the interviewer, I want to make sure that I hear from all of you about your perceptions, so please make sure we share air time by not monopolizing the conversation. We also need to allow people to finish their thoughts without interruption. Each of you will have time to speak your mind. Are there any questions before we begin?

1. What was the experience like for you?

2. Was the game fun? boring? etc.

3. Did you find the game engaging? If so, how or how not?

4. Did the experience increase your knowledge level at all?

    a. If so, how?

5. Did the experience challenge any of your attitudes or beliefs?

    a. If so, how?

    b. What attitudes or beliefs were challenged?

6. Do you think you will change any of your behaviors as a result of this experience?

    a. If yes, what behaviors do you anticipate changing?

    b. Why or why not?

7. How is this experience different from or similar to other diversity training programs?

8 . Did playing Collidascope make the topics easier or more difficult to discuss?

    a. Why?

9. How did the different learning situations (i.e., debate, role plays, create a plan, etc.) influence your experience?

10. Which situations or questions did you find most stimulating?

    a. Why?

11. Which situations or questions did you find least stimulating?

    a. Why?

12. What was it like playing in a team format?

    a. What impact did playing in teams have on the experience?

13. What were the advantages of using this game to educate?

14. What were the limitations of using the game to educate?

15. Any other comments?

APPENDIX G

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW ONE WEEK/MONTH LATER

Identification Number _____

Date _____

This is the last in a series of four interviews. The purpose of this interview is get an idea of what you remember and/or gained from the experience of playing Collidascope. Once again the interview will be about one hour in length. If you need clarification regarding a question, please ask. Take your time in responding to the questions; there are no right or wrong responses. Is there anything from either of the previous interviews or relating to the experience that you have questions or comments about? Let's begin.

1. What do you remember from the experience?

2. Did you talk with anyone about the experience?

    a. If so, what did you discuss?

3. Do you remember the topics we covered in the game?

4. If the person had previously responded that his or her attitudes and/or beliefs had been challenged, has he or she continued to be challenged?

5. If the person had previously responded that he or she anticipated some of his or her behaviors would change after playing the game, did those behaviors actually change?

6. When you hear the word <u>diversity,</u> what do you think?

    a. What do you feel?

7. Did you keep a journal as requested?

    a. What kind of entries did you write?

    b. Do you think you would have been as aware of these situations if you hadn't played the game and kept a journal? Why or why not?

8. Would you be more likely to voluntarily participate in diversity education if you played Collidascope or a similar game?

9. What were the advantages of the game?

10. Would you use this game?

11. What were the limitations of the game?

APPENDIX H

FACILITATOR POSTGAME GUIDE

This is the last in a series of two interviews. The purpose of this interview is to get feedback about your facilitation of the game Collidascope. Once again, the interview will be about one hour in length. If you need clarification regarding a question, please ask. Take your time in responding to the questions; there are no right or wrong responses. Is there anything from the previous interview or relating to the experience that you have questions or comments about? Let's begin.

1. What was the experience like for you?

2. What impact do you think the game had on the group?

3. Do you think the experience increased the group's knowledge levels?

    a. If so, how?

4. Do you think the experience challenged any of the group's attitudes or beliefs?

    a. If so, how?

    b. What attitudes or beliefs were challenged?

5. Did you learn anything from the experience, or were you challenged in any way?

6. How is this experience different from or similar to other diversity training programs you have facilitated or participated in?

7. Did playing Collidascope make the topics easier or more difficult to discuss?

    a. Why or why not?

8. How do you think the different learning situations (i.e., debate, role play, create a plan, etc.) influenced the group's experiences?

9. Which situations or questions did you find most stimulating?

    a. Why?

10. Which situations or questions did you find least stimulating?

a. Why?

11. As a facilitator, did you see any advantages in conducting diversity education with Collidascope? What were they?

12. As a facilitator, did you see any limitations in using Collidascope? What were they?

13. Do you have any additional comments?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, M., & Marchesani, L. (Eds.) (1988). Racial and cultural diversity, curriculum content and classroom dynamics: A manual for college teachers.

Arbeiter, S. (1986). Minority enrollment in higher education institutions: A chronological view. Research and development update. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1974). Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Atkinson, D. R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1983). Counseling American minorities: A cross-cultural perspective (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Bandler, R., & Grinder, J. (1976). The structure of magic. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.

Bell, L., & Schniedewind, N. (1989). Realizing the promise of humanistic education: A reconstructed pedagogy for personal and social change. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 29, 200–223.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bruner, J. S. (1966). Toward a theory of instruction. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Canfield, A. (1980). Learning styles inventory manual. Ann Arbor, MI: Humanics Media.

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. Journal of Homosexuality, 4, 219–235.

Chickering, A. (1981). Education and identity. San Franciso, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Claxton, C., & Murrell, P. H. (1987). Learning styles: Implications for improving educational practices. (ASHE-ERIC Report No. 4). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Claxton, C., & Ralston, Y. (1978). Learning styles: Their impact on teaching and administration. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 10). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. Ed 167 065.

Combs, A. W., Richards, A. C., & Richards, F. (1976). Perceptual psychology: A humanistic approach to the study of persons. New York: Harper & Row.

Creamer, D. G. (1980). Student development in higher education. Cincinnati, OH: ACPA Media.

Creamer, D. G. and Associates, (1990). College student development theory and practice for the 1990s. Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

Cross, W. E. (1991). Shades of black: Diversity in African American identity. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cullen, M. J., and Thompson, D. M. (1991). Collidascope. 48 Sunset Lane, Newfield, NY 14867.

Curry, L. (1983, April). An organization of learning styles theory and constructs. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec.

Dass, R., & Gorman, P. (1990). How can I help? New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

deCharms, R. (1983). Enhancing motivation: Change in the classroom. New York: Irvington.

Dressell, P. L., & Lehmann, I. J. (1965). The impact of higher education on student values and critical thinking abilities. Educational Record, 46 (3), 248–258.

Evan, N., & Levine, H. (1990). Perspectives on sexual orientation. In L. V. Moore (Ed.), Evolving theoretical perspectives on students (pp. 49–58), New Directions for Student Services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fizzell, R. (1984). The status of learning styles. The Educational Forum: 303–311.

Freire, P. (1968). Pedagogy of the oppressed (Myra B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Seabury Press.

Fuhrmann, B., & Grasha, A. (1983). Designing classroom experiences based on student styles and teaching styles: A practical handbook for college teaching. Boston: Little, Brown.

Goldendberg, I. I. (1978). Oppression and social intervention. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Greene, G. (1982). Towards a teaching theory of psychological education. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. (1982). The classroom climate: A chilly one for women? Washington, DC: Project on the Status of Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Harro, R. L. (1986). Teaching about heterosexism: A psychological education design project. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Helms, J. E. (1985). Cultural identity in the treatment process. In P. Pederson (Ed.), Handbook of cross-cultural counseling and therapy. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Helms, J. E. (Ed.) (1990). Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Greenwood Press.

Hill, J. E., & Nunnery, D. N. (1973). The educational science. Bloomfield Hills, MI: Oakland Community College Press.

Hunt, D. E. (1971). Matching models in education. Toronto, Ontario: Institute for Studies in Education.

Hutchings, P., & Wutzdorff, A. (Eds.) (1988). Knowing and doing: Learning through experience. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 35.

Jackson, B. W., & Hardiman, R. (1980). Oppression/liberation development theory. Unpublished manuscript.

Jackson, B. W., & Hardiman, R. (1986). Oppression: Conceptual and developmental analysis, working paper. In M. Adams & L. Marchesani (Eds.), Racial and cultural diversity, curricular content and classroom dynamics: A manual for college teachers.

Jones, W.T. (1990). Perspectives on Ethnicity. In L. V. Moore (Ed.), Evolving theoretical perspectives on students (pp. 59–72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kahn, R., & Cannell, C. (1957). The dynamics of interviewing. New York: John Wiley.

King, P. M. (1978). William Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development. In C. Widick, C. A. Parker, and L. Knefelkamp (Eds.), Applying New Developmental Findings (pp. 35–51). New Directions for Student Services, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kitchener, K. S. (1982). Human development and the college campus: Sequences and tasks. In Hanson (Ed.), Measuring student development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kolb, D. A. (1985). Learning-style inventory. Boston: McBer and Company.

Kuk, L. (1990). Perspectives on gender differences. In L. V. Moore (Ed.), Evolving theoretical perspectives on students (pp. xx–xx). New Directions for Student Services, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Loevinger, J. (1976). Ego development: Conception and theories. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Marcia, J. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 551–559.

Marienau, C., & Chickering, A. W. (1982). Adult development and learning. New Directions for Experiential Learning, 16, 7–30.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1991). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McNulty, J. (1989). Berkeley faculty approves controversial ethnic studies requirement. Black Issues in Higher Education, 6 (6), 14.

Mentkowski, M., and Strait, M. J. (1983). A longitudinal study of student change in cognitive development, learning styles, and generic abilities in an outcome-centered liberal arts curriculum (Report No. 6). Milwaukee, WI: Alverno Productions.

Mooney, C. J. (1988, Dec. 14). Sweeping curricular change is underway as Stanford University phases out its 'Western culture' program. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A1, A11–A13.

Moore, L. V. (1990). Evolving theoretical perspectives on students. New Directions for Student Services, 51.

Myers, I. B. (1976). Introduction to type. Gainesville, FL: Center for the Application for Psychological Type.

Nickle, J. (1990/1991). Empathy. Columbia, SC: Harbinger Publications.

Parker, C. A., Widick, C., & Knefelkamp, L. (1978). Arthur Chickering's vectors of development. In Applying new developmental findings. New Directions for Student Services, 4, 19–35.

Perry, W. G., Jr. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Podd, M., Marcia, J., and Rubin, B. (1970). The effects of ego-identity and partner perception on a prisoner's dilemma game. Journal of Social Psychology, 82, 117–126.

Pope, R. L., Ecklund, T., Mueller, J., & Reynolds, A. L. (1990, April). Combating racism in higher education. Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association Convention [ACPA], St. Louis, MO.

Prince, J. S., Miller, T. K., and Winston, R. B. (1974). Student development task inventory guidelines. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates.

Rodgers, R. F. (1980). Theories underlying student development. In D. G. Creamer (Ed.), Student development in higher education (pp. 10–97). Cincinnati, OH: ACPA Media.

Rodgers, R. F. (1990). Recent theories and research underlying student development. In D. G. Creamer (Ed.), College student development theory and practice for the 1990s. Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

Sapp, G. L., Elliott, G. R., & Gounds, S. (1983). Dealing with diversity among college students. Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 22, 80–85.

Smith, A. F. (1978). Lawrence Kohlberg's cognitive stage theory of the development of moral judgment. In C. Widick, C. A. Parker, and L. Knefelkamp (Eds.), Applying new developmental findings (pp. 53–67). New Directions for Student Services, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sprinthall, N. A., & McVay, J. G. (1987). Value development during the college years. Counseling and Values, 31, 126–138.

Sprinthall, N. A., & Sprinthall, R. C. (1981, 1990). Educational psychology: A developmental approach. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Stice, J. E. (1987). Using Kolb's learning cycle to improve student learning. Engineering Education, 77, 291–296.

Sugarman, L. (1985). Kolb's model of experiential learning. Journal of Counseling and Development, 64, 264–268.

Thomas, R., and Chickering, A. W. (1984). Education and identity revisited. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 392–399.

Weinstein, G., & Alschuler, A. S. (1985). Educating and counseling for self-knowledge development. Journal of Counseling and Development, 64, 19–25.

Weinstein, G., & Bell L. (Eds.). Anti-oppression education. Unpublished manuscript, 1983.

Weinstein, G. (1988). Design elements for intergroup awareness training. Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 13, 96–103.